

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XIX

March • 1941

No. 3

THE SINEWS OF PEACE

Bernard W. Dempsey

Father De Smet

W. Patrick Donnelly

Forerunners of Marx

James F. Hanley

High School History

W. Barby Faherty

Gasquet vs Constant

Sr. M. Paul Fitzgerald

JESUIT NOTES

R. Corrigan

Editorials

Book Reviews

A BIBLIOGRAPHY

for

Scholastic Philosophy

other features

- ST. THOMAS ON INDIVIDUATION . . . Joseph B. Wall
 THE NEW ETHICS Thomas E. Davitt
 THE PLUNGE INTO REALITY . . . Gerald F. Van Akeren
 Discussion: MOLECULAR AND } John S. O'Connor and
 ATOMIC CONTINUITY . . . } James A. McWilliams

Editorial

Book Reviews

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN... March 1941

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, St. Louis, Mo.

\$1.00 yearly

Single copies 35 cents

(Separate copies of the bibliography 25 cents)

The publishers of *Philosophic Abstracts* take
 pleasure in announcing for Summer 1941
 publication

THE DICTIONARY of PHILOSOPHY

Although embraced in one volume, the dictionary covers metaphysics, ethics, epistemology, logic, philosophy of religion, esthetics, philosophy of law, philosophy of education, social philosophy and philosophical psychology. Special emphasis has been placed on the definition of basic concepts and terms germane to the contemporary schools of philosophy, logical positivism, dialectical materialism, mathematical logic, neo-scholasticism, philosophy of science, Chinese, Jewish and Indian philosophy.

The DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY is edited by Dagobert D. Runes with the collaboration of Alonzo Church, Rudolf Carnap, G. Watts Cunningham, Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Irwin Edman, Rudolf Allers, A. C. Ewing, Ralph Tyler Flewelling, Jorgen Jorgensen, Ledger Wood, William Marias Malisoff, Carl G. Hempel, B. A. G. Fuller, A. Cornelius Benjamin, Hunter Guthrie, Wilbur Long, V. J. McGill, A. C. Pegis, Glenn R. Morrow, Joseph Ratner, Wendell T. Bush, Dorion Cairns, James K. Feibleman, Paul A. Schillp, Paul Weiss and a number of other scholars.

Applications for further literature, as well as
 other communications, should be addressed to:

PHILOSOPHIC ABSTRACTS

15 EAST 40th STREET

NEW YORK CITY

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

College of Arts and Sciences.....	221 North Grand Blvd.
College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant.....	Florissant, Mo.
Graduate School.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Divinity.....	St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas
School of Medicine.....	1402 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Law.....	3642 Lindell Blvd.
School of Philosophy and Science.....	3633 West Pine
School of Dentistry.....	3556 Caroline Street
School of Commerce and Finance.....	3674 Lindell Blvd.
School of Education and Social Science.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Nursing.....	1325 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Social Work.....	207 North Grand Blvd.

THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

Fontbonne College.....	Wydown and Big Bend Blvds.
Maryville College.....	Meramec and Nebraska Avenues
Webster College.....	Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri
Notre Dame Junior College.....	Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis
Saint Mary's Junior College.....	O'Fallon, Missouri

THE HOSPITALS

1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS
 - (a) St. Mary's Hospital.....Clayton and Bellevue Avenues
 - (b) Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1325 South Grand Blvd.
 - (c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium.....9101 South Broadway
2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS
 - (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital.....3933 South Broadway
 - (b) St. Anthony's Hospital.....Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
 - (c) St. John's Hospital.....307 South Euclid Avenue

3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Infirmary.....1536 Papin Street
- (b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit I.....1515 Lafayette Ave.
- (c) Homer G. Phillips Hospital.....2601 Whittier
- (d) St. Louis City Sanitarium.....5300 Arsenal Street
- (e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital.....5600 Arsenal Street

AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing—
3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. John's Hospital School of Nursing.....307 S. Euclid Ave.

THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT
Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1315 South Grand Boulevard
2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS
 - (a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary.....3933 South Broadway
 - (b) St. John's Dispensary.....4945 Audubon Avenue

THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- (a) City Dispensary.....1515 Lafayette Avenue
- (b) The Obstetric Dispensaries
St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association
St. Ann's Foundling Asylum
- (c) The Pre-Natal Clinics
The Cass Avenue Clinic
The Bethesda Dispensary

WHITE HOUSE

St. Louis House of Retreats—
 White House, Jefferson Barracks P. O., Missouri

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933.

VOL. XIX

MARCH, 1941

No. 3

Table of Contents

THE SINEWS OF PEACE	BERNARD W. DEMPSEY	51
THE SOURCES OF MARXIAN THOUGHT	JAMES F. HANLEY	53
EDITORIALS		55
FATHER DE SMET: A REVIEW	W. PATRICK DONNELLY	57
HISTORY IN THE CLASSROOM	W. B. FAHERTY	59
THE ENGLISH REFORMATION	SISTER M. PAUL FITZGERALD	61
JESUIT NOTES	RAYMOND CORRIGAN	63
BOOK REVIEWS		67

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the Catholic Magazine Index of *The Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*

The Sinews of Peace

Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., Ph. D.

St. Louis University

WE are all painfully aware that life is more complicated than we would like it. If things were simpler life would be so much easier; there would not be so many things to keep account of. Fortunately, behind the complexities there are usually a few ruling factors, and if we can find them out, then things do become simpler.

Our present feverish state of economic turmoil, social revolution and international war has two deep roots. There is a clear parallel in the political and economic developments of our modern world. If we can see these two factors working together, our problem is much simplified. With a little past history and a little current economics, I will try to show 1) how both economics and politics have followed the same principle of development, 2) how that principle is clearly false, and 3) what we can do about it at least in our domestic affairs.

The President-Chancellor of the Third Reich is fond of stating that when this war is over and won the settlements which mark its formal closing will be signed not in the Hall of Mirrors within the formal gardens of Versailles but at Münster in Westphalia. This is not a chance whim of his: this is a matter of calculated policy to which he has repeatedly referred. The signing of the French armistice in the same railroad car in which the Armistice of 1918 was signed was a minor matter, a spur of the moment affair. That the new order should be born at Münster has been planned for years back.

The reasons for this fixed idea are worth investigating and regardless of the Chancellor's motives in emphasizing the place, they are instructive. They shed light on current events and on much past history. They shed light for example on the answer to this question: Why is

Germany, today so powerful and menacing a factor in world affairs, unheard of until recent generations? Before 1870, France, England, Spain, Sweden played a role in world affairs but not Germany. Germany, as is obvious today, is a large and populous territory, reasonably well equipped with the means of livelihood, with a population intelligent, industrious, moral, at once patient and poetic. Before 1870 Prussia had worked its way up to a second rate power; Austria, Bavaria and Saxony, for example, were kingdoms of some weight but they were not Germany. Bavaria in particular looked rather to France for cooperation and support than to its German speaking neighbors to the East. But there was no Germany. Some explanation of this striking fact can be found at Münster.

Political Concentration

In the year 1648 the Thirty Years War ended with the Treaty of Westphalia signed at Münster. Germany, of course, was not properly a party to that war because Germany as such did not exist, but the territory we call Germany was the scene of the war. The war was long and complex but the general idea was that Bourbon France, herself unified and centralized, in alliance with Sweden, sought to prevent the Austrian House of Hapsburg, also ruling in Spain, from unifying the German states as the French Kings had succeeded in organizing and centralizing the French duchies into an efficient whole. The policy was fully carried out; France achieved her goal almost perfectly. The Holy Roman Empire, the one source of political unity in Europe, weakened by the religious differences after the treaty of Westphalia became an empty symbol. The Grand Monarch of France, Louis XIV, into whose mouth have been put the words, "I am the State," was the big man of Europe

as two great ministers, Richelieu and Mazarin, had planned to make him.

And what of the Germans? For thirty years war had swept back and forth across the territory, a war in which large sections of the German people were passive factors. Certainly more than one-half and almost certainly two-thirds of the population disappeared, killed in the repeated invasions that pillaged the same town five and six times. Forty percent of the improved land went out of cultivation and scrub growth over-ran what had been farms. Approximately two-thirds of the durable capital goods of the country was destroyed; the roads, bridges, canals, boats, docks, dwellings, barns, herds and flocks—the long accumulation of prudent thrift of common people, all these were wiped out. Eighty percent of the towns and villages ceased to be dwelling places of men; they were destroyed or deserted. As a result of this, the Hanseatic League, a cooperative union of some sixty cities for inter-regional trade, the greatest agency of medieval commerce, withered and died. The triumph of France was complete. The Bourbon needed no longer fear the Hapsburg at his back. Germany as a political factor had ceased to exist. Beyond the Rhine was chaos where the wolves came into the villages boldly from the forest; and three hundred petty princes ruled over pauper courts.

France's security and supremacy were, in historical terms, short-lived indeed. A new centralized power had arisen. Strong men under weak foreign kings were making England a power by sea if not by land. In England not a family but a small cohesive class held the reins. In 1689 the commercial men of England took over the state which had been unified and centralized for them by the absolutism of the Tudors and the Stuarts. After a year which appeared in our history as the French and Indian War, England had definitely wrested world dominance from France and was firmly planted in France's former domains, thus preparing the way for the French Revolution and Napoleon. France never recovered the power she had wielded from 1648 to 1763.

Meanwhile, what of Germany? Slowly, painfully and laboriously Germany was piecing together a devastated territory; the rudiments of order began to appear in the chaos beyond the Rhine. Prussia learned the lessons France and England had to teach and began the process of unification and centralization that had made them powerful. By 1813, Prussia was powerful enough to be an important factor in the defeat of Napoleon by the "Allies," Russia, Austria, Prussia and England. But Prussia was not Germany; there remained literally hundreds of minute principalities in the territory today called Germany.

By 1870, however, the unifying process was completed. Policies were in fewer hands in Germany as they were in fewer and fewer in France and England. Prussia led the Germans against France to do as far as possible to France what France had done to Germany in 1648. Success was swift and thorough; the France of Louis XIV and Napoleon was no more, and the windows of Paris shuddered to Schubert's *Marche Militaire*. An indemnity of \$1,000,000,000 was imposed upon France and the iron deposits of Lorraine and the textile industry and potash deposits of Alsace passed into German hands. Germany

took this indemnity (which looked enormous in those simple days) and used it to establish a currency on the gold standard with a central bank modeled on England's. A free trade policy was introduced at first, but it did not take Bismarck long to realize the difference between Germany's position and England's. England, a small country with a large industrial population, had need of the world's raw products and had to keep an open door for food for her people and raw materials for her mills. A flood of English goods showed Bismarck that Germany's enormous potentialities would never be able to function under free-trade circumstances and the tariffs of 1879 and 1902 marked Germany's entrance into the great international game of beggar my neighbor.

The development of Germany from 1870 to 1910 was prodigious and was ascribed to every possible influence under the sun. No complex explanation was needed. Germany was finally getting good utilization of natural resources that had lain dormant from 1648 to 1870. The internal market was widened with the disappearance of the innumerable small states; basic services, like currency and communications, were simplified and improved; a far more economic division of labor was possible and wealth once increased multiplied itself. Germany now was unified and centralized as had been the France which eliminated her and the England which eliminated France. To be secure in the enjoyment of her accomplishments and to enjoy even further outlets for her rapidly expanding production, it remained only to eliminate England as England had eliminated France.

Unpredictable Uncle Shylock

This Germany sought to do in 1914. The Empire of the twentieth century would be hers as former centuries had belonged to Spain, France and England in turn. And Germany practically succeeded in subduing England, but the to-be-expected sequence of events was interfered with by a new factor. The United States entered the game, defeated Germany and then withdrew from the division of the spoils, with the paradoxical result that the most crushing terms were imposed upon Germany by nations that had virtually lost the war. England and France took full advantage of the opportunity, but forgot that they were imposing a peace which, without the United States, they were incapable of enforcing. Germany was still too strong and too productive to be dominated by nations she had defeated and yet the United States reverted to a policy of isolation having no desire to succeed to England's role as ring master of Europe. This conduct was inconsistent with the logic of liberal Europe! America had won; New York had supplanted London as the world's financial center; America had only to mount the saddle and ride as France and England had done and as Germany had sought to do. But America remained at home.

Such a policy ran counter to the European system and was quite unintelligible to liberal nationalism. That policy has led to twenty years of unheard of disorder in international affairs in which Europe has shown herself thoroughly incapable of reconstruction. If America had imposed and enforced a peace, that might have been unpleasant but it would have been a language understood.

(Please turn to page sixty-two)

The Sources of Marxian Thought

James F. Hanley, S. J., A. B.

St. Louis University

KARL MARX and Friedrich Engels met for the first time in 1844 at Paris. Marx had been born at Trier in the Rhineland in 1818, had attended Bonn, Berlin and Jena, and had been recently exiled from his native land because of his political and philosophical views. Engels, born in 1820, was also a native of the Rhineland, but his education had been less intensive, for he had spent the greater part of his adult life at Manchester, where he managed a cotton mill belonging to his father. The combination of talent and literary endeavor that we find in these two men is quite out of the ordinary. Engels attributes all the inspiration of their work to Marx, declaring that the new ideas were developed by Marx and that the general trend of all their theories was determined by the elder man. Nevertheless, it was the literary ability of Engels that effected the first great diffusion of the ideas of Scientific Socialism, Dialectical Materialism, or Communism. True, Marx wrote *Das Kapital*, but those three volumes are nothing more than a mass of economic and historical data, which attempt to prove what Engels had previously asserted in a half-dozen books.

Engels held no particular philosophical tenets at the time of his first meeting with Marx, but the latter had the beginnings of a philosophy, culled from many fields and full of portentous possibilities for what was later to be known as Communism. Engels adopted his colleague's philosophy in its entirety, with the result that the philosophical background of Marx is the philosophical background of Communism, even as we know it today. The beginnings of Dialectical Materialism stem directly from the radical spirit known as Young Germany, the spirit of a disillusioned generation without belief in God or supersensuous good, rife with cynicism and hypercritical in the extreme. There is no need to trace the thought patterns of this group through its own evolutionary positivism and the Hegelian idealism that preceded it to its source in the "Copernican Revolution" of Kant. It is sufficient for the present purpose to examine the particular tenets of Marx himself, the tenets he expounded to Engels at Paris in 1844.

In his philosophical studies at Bonn and Berlin Marx learned Hegelianism as well as one Hegelian can be said by another to have understood the common philosophical doctrines. But revolt was in the air, and even the accepted idealism of the German universities was not safe. Strauss and Bauer were convinced that the philosophy of Hegel was the bulwark of Prussian Lutheranism, and so it is not surprising that, when Marx came under the influence of these bitter foes of Christianity,¹ he began to leave the accustomed groove of his previous training. At about this same period Ludwig Feuerbach began his advocacy of crass eighteenth century materialism. Marx became enchanted by the Feuerbachian theses—so enchanted, in fact, that he revised and altered them

into what was the beginning of Dialectical Materialism. It will be recalled that Fichte and Hegel developed the idea of progress through the interaction of opposites—one element, thesis, being opposed by its contrary, antithesis, gives rise to a new element, synthesis, which in turn may become the subject of further development through its opposite. It was no small shock for Hegelians, ultra-idealists, to see their own dialectical process used in an attempt to prove the self-sufficiency of matter. But Marx made the attempt:² he claimed that the dialectic *did* apply to matter; that by the interaction of contraries matter developed of itself (no Creator being necessary, since matter was eternal and equipped for self-development); that, finally, since matter is the only thing that exists, the Hegelian concepts of Idea out of Itself and Idea in Itself were mere chimeras, and not very good ones at that.

In those days even the government took philosophy seriously, and before Marx could really get started with his advocacy of the new system, he found himself on the French side of the international border, exiled by a Prussian government that would brook no offensive distortion of the beloved dialectic. But, as far as the fundamentals of his philosophy were concerned, Marx was satisfied. At Paris he saw the miserable condition of the factory workers and began to grapple with the social problem, having three fundamental philosophical convictions in mind: the reality and self-sufficiency of matter and the mind's ability to know it; the truth of the dialectic as applied to matter; the entirely material make-up of man.

In 1847 Marx wrote a small booklet, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, in which he condemned the theories of Proudhon. This fact throws light on that peculiar quality of Marx's eclecticism which leads him to pick up a theory, make it his own through a series of changes, and then criticize and condemn the original author. In 1843 Proudhon had exerted great influence on Scientific Socialism, then in its formative stage. This he did by impressing upon Marx the advantages he claimed would ensue from the abolition of religion, the state, and private property.³ Proudhon's system, essentially an anarchistic one, would reduce all men to a condition in which there would be none of what he conceived to be organized institutions of greed. Marx and Engels liked the anarchist's conclusions—they presented some practical means of dealing with the social problem on a large scale. It was the reasoning of Proudhon that Marx criticized in his *Poverty of Philosophy*. Proudhon was too utopian, too casual, too unscientific. Marx and Engels would overthrow basic institutions, but they would show how a communistic state would come about and how it would function when established. They sought to prove scientifically what Proudhon had merely asserted: namely, that private property, religion, and the state were the

¹ Sidney Hook, "The Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism," *Journal of Philosophy*, XXV (March 1, 1928), 114

² C. E. M. Joad, *Guide to Philosophy* (New York, 1936), 404

³ E. Carr in *Karl Marx* (London, 1934), 32, mentions that Proudhon also suggested the leading ideas of economic determinism to Marx.

three roots of social evil, the three tools of bourgeois exploitation of the masses.

Economic Determinism

Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon, was another Frenchman who exerted an influence upon Marx and Engels during this early period, but in a way quite different from that of Proudhon. Saint-Simon, advocating a sort of corporate state directed by scientists and engineers, had the usual utopian dream of a perfect government making for a contented and prosperous people. Unlike most of the agitators in the field of political philosophy, however, he was at pains to follow what he thought to be a scientific approach to the problems confronting society in the modern era. His conclusions, after a rather penetrating analysis of the various historical periods, left much to be desired as far as Marx was concerned. Saint-Simon would not abolish private property, nor would he favor the extermination of religion or the state. In spite of these conclusions he had a great influence upon Marx. He incited Marx to a more scientific application of philosophical method in the realm of economics, and he gave Marx a hint as to the direction successful thought must take in dealing with the organization of society. Further, it was from the French philosopher that Marx took his explanation of the revolutionary character of historical progress.⁴ In his outline of history Saint-Simon indicated a transition from the military regime, as represented by the medieval institutions, to the industrial regime of his own day. This was the sort of thing that appealed to Marx, for he always had the dialectic in the back of his head when dealing with any evolutionary process. When he read Saint-Simon's proposition to the effect that these revolutions took place because of the fact that the worlds of thought and action did not synchronize, Marx had the beginnings of his own interpretation of history.

No man of the nineteenth century was so deeply read in the mass of contemporary economic writing as was Marx. It was inevitable, then, that he should be affected by the Hegelian economist, Lorenz von Stein, who posited the proposition that economic forces were the cause of all historical change. Marx had his own formula: "Human activity is governed in its entirety by man's material wants and the methods he uses in satisfying them." Communistic theory goes on from this point, always trying to show that the changes in the means of production caused the human race to evolve from a primitive state of classless society with no religious or political organization and with no one possessing property of his own, to the complex social structure of our own day. Inspired by von Stein and Saint-Simon, Marx proceeded to apply the dialectic to history. Orthodox Hegelians were again shocked by the brazen effrontery of dialectical materialism. Only recently they had been amazed to see their beloved dialectic used to prove the self-sufficiency of matter. Now, Marx used it in an attempt to show that the *ens perfectissimum* of Hegelian philosophy, the state, was an artificial thing, concocted by prehistoric men and doomed to extinction by the evolutionary forces of historical progress.

⁴ John Merz, *A History of European Thought in The Nineteenth Century* (London, 1914), IV, 539

Hegel believed that all human social organizations, especially the state, are natural to man, since they are founded in right order.⁵ Right order is the subjection of the individual will to those restrictions which are necessary for the common good. This order obtains under conditions of a contract by which men recognize the natural rights of society. It must not be thought that Hegel agrees with Hobbes in placing the whole *raison d'être* of the state in a free contract. No, Hegel thought that the state was the highest achievement of nature, and hence not dependent in its essence upon arbitrary human agreements. Marx saw that Hegel was vulnerable here, and he pressed the issue in the development of a theory of his own that the state is artificial, created by land-owners, a giant policeman. In primitive society all men held all the land in common, and property rights arose when these men granted some of their number the contractual right of holding property apart from their fellows.⁶ These property-owners acquired their rights by superior ability to use the means of production, and in order to hold their position, they invented the state as an organization capable of upholding economic advantage.

Religion, with its supposition of immortality and the existence of God, receives equally abrupt dismissal at the hands of Marx and Engels. They claimed that in the early periods of human existence men feared the attacks of the elements and by appealing for the protection of fictitious gods they obtained surcease from their terror. Thus the fictitious gods were the opiate of the people.⁷ Communism claims that this private religion was built up into a complex system of religious beliefs by the property-owning class in order that the state might have a supernatural power sponsoring it and continue to protect property rights. In modern times the gods of the early ages have been distilled down to one God, but the religion of today still fulfills the double rôle of early times. It is the opiate of the people, for the proletariat is led by religious beliefs to hope for a future life of bliss while enduring the torments of bourgeois exploitation. It is the protector of property-owners because it still gives sanction to state protection of property rights.

With their convictions on economic determinism, the artificial basis of religion, the state, and private property ever before their minds, the two agitators began the publication of their views on the intimate nature of social change, applying the dialectic to history, especially to those divisions of history already pointed out by Saint-Simon. Their views on the subject are contained in *The Communist Manifesto*, written in 1848. It is the first communist propaganda pamphlet. An amazingly clever piece of work, it exhibits all the enthusiasm of a fanatic and all the ingenuity of a statistician juggling figures to prove a debatable proposition. As will be seen, Marx and Engels failed to verify their economic theories by factual evidence—in truth, all the evidence is against them; their chief success and greatest merit as thinkers, according to many critics, lie in their ability to synthesize the forces

⁵ George Hegel, *A Philosophy of Right* (Berlin, 1816), III, 257-340

⁶ Friedrich Engels, *Herr Duhring's Revolution in Science* (New York, 1935), 156

⁷ Karl Marx, *Selected Essays of Karl Marx* (New York, 1926), 16

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

RAYMOND CORRIGAN, *Editor*

Staff

CHARLES J. MEHOK	ROBERT W. LAMBECK
GEORGE M. PIEFER	EUGENE H. KORTH
PETER O. PRICE	URBAN J. KRAMER
EARL J. KURTH	FLOYD L. STANTON

Advisory Board

MARTIN J. HARNEY Boston College	FRANCIS S. BETTEN Marquette University
THOMAS F. MAHER Gonzaga University	W. PATRICK DONNELLY Spring Hill College
CHARLES H. METZGER West Baden College	PETER M. DUNNE University of San Francisco
	GERALD G. WALSH Fordham University

RAYMOND R. MCAULEY, *Business Manager*

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

EDITORIALS

Secularism

In October, 1939, the National Catholic Alumni Federation met in New York to discuss the most radical and all-pervading disease in modern society. That disease is secularism. If the addresses of the fifteen speakers had not been of such high quality and so vitally important for a sick world, we might not be disappointed at the delay of a full year and more in publishing them (*Man and Secularism*. New York. 1940). We are disappointed. But the problem is still with us, and its virulence has in no way lessened visibly. The speakers talked in terms of education, but of education bound up as it must be with life, civilization, culture, man. And being physicians concerned with the health of their patient or, perhaps better, being psychiatrists intent upon leading a loony, paranoiac civilization back to sanity, they naturally devoted considerable time to historical antecedents.

After a very adequate and penetrating survey of the historical background of the case by Ross Hoffman, come seven addresses under the triple caption: Religion in the Making of America; Secularism and the Unmaking of America; and Religion in the Remaking of America. The last division is, of course, more hopeful than strictly historical, though we are grateful for Louis Mercier's assurance that there is already a wholesome reaction against secularism. For the historian one of the best distinctions we have seen is that of Professor Hoffman, between "the rise of a lay civilization and the growth of an atheistic exclusion of God and religion from life . . ." There is a parallel development of the two, but no necessary connection. The Church, he tells us, did not create modern progress, but it formed the kind of men who were capable of launching a great creative work. Secularism, on the other hand, is the mortal enemy of high human achievement.

Richard J. Purcell combs through early documents to show that free government in America, along with freedom of the schools, the pulpit and the press, is rooted in religion. Thomas F. Woodlock sees in the educational system of our country the great danger of totalitarianism in "democratic" clothing. Rightly he insists that the secularized boy or girl has no logical defense of the

loyalty he pays to his or her flag. Father Geoffrey O'Connell names and quotes the men (at Columbia University for the most part) whose "progressive education" is the biggest standing menace to our free institutions. Robert C. Pollock makes a point when he reprimands Catholics for one-sidedly affirming spiritual values as an answer to those who one-sidedly affirm the temporal. A flight of all good souls to the sacristy or the cloister is not going to bring God back to government, business or social life. Atheists and agnostics have used their God-given talents to beautify and improve God's fair world. It is no surprise to the philosopher of history to see limited human minds completely absorbed in the pursuit of limited human objectives, to see partial good perverted into a substitute for the highest Good. Secularism is as natural as pernicious anemia or blood-poisoning. And it will be fatal to lay civilization, for you cannot drive out God without doing violence to reason, liberty and personality, which are so essential to our unique and still fundamentally Christian culture.

The New York Convention

History repeated itself at the fifty-fifth annual meeting of the American Historical Association, which was held in New York during the Christmas holidays. There was the usual milling around in the corridors, the usual smiled greetings and hand-shaking, dinners and luncheons, more or less tedious sessions and serious conferences. There were bright spots and dull spots on the printed program which carried nearly three hundred names of rising, reigning and declining masters as well as of ambitious unknowns. A tyro with the sponge instinct had no end of opportunity to absorb the flow, sometimes sparkling, often shallow and insipid, of historical fact and philosophy. Anyone would be impressed by the evident growth and expansion of the association. At least a few of us observed a laudable struggling toward the light on the part of men who, thanks to current disillusionment perhaps, are sincere in their search for the deeper truth behind the endless rush of phenomena.

I have before me the impressions of a graduate student, jotted down at the end of this, his first major convention.

In spite of the "intense physical fatigue" of the crowded days, the "stiffness and formality of many unknowns" and the confusion of thought displayed on "the basic question: What are we trying to do?" he notes a gratifying "revulsion from relativism, a renaissance of the respectability of the doctrine of absolute values, of the doctrine that there are distinctions of kind as well as of degree." The historians are not yet ready for a mandate to solve all the world's problems. But in what they do attempt they are remarkably free from the wild theorizing that too frequently finds expression in other groups. Their company is no place for the cynic, the sceptic, the relativist. They respect religion, specifically the Catholic religion, and they have a high regard for the ultimate verities.

The Catholic Historical Association

In all, some fifteen associations shared the New York meeting. Among these our own Catholic Historical Association presented its twenty-first annual Christmas program. Numerous clerical collars and a variety of religious habits must have impressed the casual onlooker in the big hotel. No one could doubt that Catholics were interested in history. But there is a fairly general impression abroad that should be corrected. In a friendly conversation with a past president of the A. H. A. the writer had occasion to suppress some natural indignation. Asked whether we (Catholics) were having a good convention, I pretended not to understand the meaning of the great man's question. After all, we (Catholics as well as others) were attending the same convention. We dislike being considered a sort of side-show, very much outside the main circus tent. And this, for two weighty reasons. We want to be accepted on purely academic grounds as historians and members of the A. H. A. We do not want to be looked upon as a separate body which happens to be meeting at the same hotel. And secondly we want the historical menu served at our meetings to be of a kind and calibre to attract all who are interested in historical truth.

Monsignor Guilday has given years of devoted service to the C. H. A. He has nursed it through a long period of infancy and adolescence; he has encouraged younger historians in their first steps on the public stage; he has been a master in procuring helpful publicity and a hard-working organizer amid the thankless drudgery behind the scenes; he has lent the prestige of his own scholarly achievement to the association. No other leader could have done the things he has done, nor done them so well. The association is his monument. And it still needs his help. But he cannot carry the whole burden alone. It is time for a little more aggressive initiative, about equally shared by a splendid corps of laymen (I have in mind a dozen or so past presidents) and a somewhat larger number of priests and religious. Anybody who knows anything about an organization like ours, knows that it has to have a live and capable secretary. But the most dynamic secretary on earth is powerless if atrophy and paralysis pervade the membership. This begins to look like criticism. Maybe we are unduly perturbed by the anxiety of a well-meaning friend who regretted that he could never find our former presidents and other eminent scholars at our meetings.

At the risk of being thought presumptuous, or at least slightly premature, but without claiming any credit for originality, we venture to suggest an experiment. Why not limit ourselves to *one* Catholic day at the annual Christmas Week convention, *plus* a joint-session with the A. H. A.? If necessary, this Catholic day could be one of the three days normally devoted to the A. H. A. meeting. But it so happens that next year and the following year we shall have a Sunday, December 27 and 28, immediately preceding the first day of the general convention. Our morning session could be given over to a panel discussion of a point of sufficient interest to justify whatever sacrifice of time participants may have to make. In the afternoon three or four papers could be read. There could be a luncheon with or without speech-making. The presidential address could be given at the end of an annual dinner. This Catholic day would be one that few of us would want to miss. And it would free us from the unpleasant task of apologizing for walking out on Catholic speakers, as we often have to do now.

It will seem odd to urge curtailing our activities at a time when the A. H. A. is spreading itself all over the world's biggest hotels. But the sad fact is that ten years ago, or three years ago, there was more life and interest in our "semi-public" seances than there is at present. Our programs may be as good as they ever were; they may be decidedly better. But too many Catholics as well as non-Catholics do not seem to know it, or to care. A single well-planned joint session with an opportunity for open discussion would compensate for the loss of three languid days. A few of us would be deprived of the joy of listening to our own papers. But the editor of the *Catholic Historical Review* could provide a substitute outlet for thwarted ambition. There is also the practical possibility of increased participation in the A. H. A. programs.

The Pope Speaks

The past hundred years has been the most glorious century of the papacy. At least, if we consider the uniformly high calibre of the men who have sat in the chair of Peter, if we regard the providential role played by each of seven successive pontiffs, if we balance their increasing moral prestige against their utter lack of material means and their intrepidity against discouraging difficulties, we shall conclude that no other long period has been quite comparable to the pontificates from Gregory XVI to the present. And it would not be hard to show that each pope possessed some decided advantage over his predecessor. Finally, each fitted almost perfectly into the part assigned him, and any interchange of position in the order of succession would scarcely have been an improvement. There are reasons why Pius X or Pius XI or Pius XII may claim first place in our affection and esteem. All of them have spoken words of wisdom in time of need. But never has the frenzied world been more ready to listen than it is now.

It will be easier to pass something like definitive judgment upon Pius XII twenty years hence. We know now that he is a great pope, and that he is recognized as such. He has the personal qualities of intellect and heart, he

(Please turn to page sixty-four)

Father De Smet: A Review

W. Patrick Donnelly, S. J., M. A.

St. Mary, Kansas

WHEN a good writer gets hold of a good story the result is bound to be a good book. And when a highly talented literary craftsman pools resources with an historical account that is so romantic that it fairly prances in its own right, the result is certain to be an excellent book. It is this latter which has made Helene Magaret's *Father De Smet, Pioneer Priest of the Rockies*, (Farrar & Rinehart, \$3.00) one of the best books of the year and the apt choice of the Catholic-Book-of-the-month Club for December last.

The place of Pierre Jean De Smet in the history of the west is monumental. The strictly accurate and scientific historical record of the giant who brought to a close more than three centuries of heroic Jesuit trail-blazing missionary activity on the American continent reads like a tale from the Arabian Nights. On the basis of pioneering achievement De Smet's work in the American west forms the last chapter in the great book of Jesuit missionary giants, a book that lists martyrs like Jogues and Brebeuf, or explorers like Kino and Marquette; a book that splices the American nation together with trails that run from New York to California and from Oregon to Florida; a book that makes the whole Western Hemisphere from the Gulf of Saint Lawrence to the Straits of Magellan a single piece of Jesuit history, printed in the bold type of man's love for man in the name of God, and inked in the sweat and blood of the spiritual *conquistadores* that fought and died in the militia that went by the name of the Company of Jesus.

Father De Smet's field of activity was as broad and unrestricted as the open plains and the sprawling mountains of the great American west. It was a lean year when the missionary traveled less than 4,000 miles in the interest of the Indians of the west; during many of the years that fill out his thirty-year span of activity, he piled up more than 10,000 miles per year. And this was in the days when transportation was largely by river or ocean steamer, canoe, dog-sled or horseback. De Smet's glory was not in dying for the Indians but in living for them! In time his own facial appearance assumed the aspect of a noble Indian chief. There is no title which describes his inner feelings and outward activity quite so significantly as *The White Indian*.

Father De Smet rubbed shoulders or had dealings and connections with some of the leading characters and movements that made the west throb during the most important years of its upbuilding. He was an intimate friend of Missouri's pioneer Senator Thomas Hart Benton, who said of De Smet that he could do more in keeping the Indians at peace with the whites "than an army with banners," and whose son De Smet baptized a Catholic as the lad lay on his deathbed. He was the friend and confidant of the Missouri river steamboat captains, whom the movies have thus far failed to exploit. He conferred with Lincoln on the Indian problem, and acted in cooperation with General William T. Sherman of Civil War fame. He was closely associated with the

Reverend Francis Norbert Blanchet, first Vicar Apostolic and Archbishop of Oregon, and had fruitful and grateful contact with the tragically noble Dr. John McLoughlin, the most picturesque character that ever laid hand to a pelt for the Hudson Bay Company. Forty-niners, emigrants, even the Mormons, asked his advice on the west. Important trappers, traders, guides, explorers, he knew by the score. But all this was incidental to his preoccupation with the redmen for whom he lived and labored.

De Smet was the Saint Paul of the west, an 'American of the Americans' because he was democratic, and 'an Indian to the Indians' because he would gain them to Christ, bringing them the Gospel message, baptizing and spreading the faith to the heathen tribesmen whom the elect, chosen American people, either despised or feared, or more often both. In time, from long years of missionary travels, extensive familiarity with the tribes of the plains and mountains, commissions as peace ambassador from the United States government to warring tribes, Father De Smet was elevated to a unique place in the history of Indian and white in the far west. He was the solitary white man that the whole multitude of these Indians trusted absolutely, the man whose influence over the western Indians exceeded that of any other white man. The pedestal that raised him to this lofty eminence was laid on the solid granite rocks of achievement, sincere Christian love for the Indians, and personal charm.

For all his importance from a strictly historical standpoint, Pierre Jean De Smet is as absent from the pages of secular historical works on the west as the now extinct buffalo from the western plains. Eventually this will not be so, and Helene Magaret's book will help lift the sun on that dawning day. The author has brought to the cause of De Smet the most facile pen that has yet been wielded in making him known. Her mastery of word painting makes his story glow with something of the brilliance of a setting sun that silhouettes in its glow the towering mountain that was De Smet, and strikes something of the same poignant emotion evoked by the breathtakingly beautiful adieu of the departing sun. Taking the west as her canvas she fills in scenery, debonair or dissicate, with the same artistic finesse. She gives the reader the vicarious thrills of travel on a Missouri river steamboat, or the hazardous danger-fraught entry into the Columbia river from the sea; the dust and flatness of the plain, the clear air of the mountains, fresh and green, or frosty and cold. Her characterizations have real flesh and blood on their bones, and if they use mild profanity with the regularity of breathing, it is because they are part and parcel of the frontier west. Her handling of dialogue is skilful and natural, and only rarely rings a trifle hollow or forced. In the portrayal of deep human emotion she frequently hits high voltage. She possesses the creative faculty of hitting off an occasional quotable dictum, such as "When God goes with a man, danger becomes like the horizon—it recedes. Even a horse at full gallop can't overtake it." In a word her style is interesting, her sense of the dramatic high, her theme epic.

The chief difficulty which most reviewers of Miss Magaret's book have experienced is in discerning precisely where to draw the line between the book's history and its creative writing. It is an inherent difficulty that goes with all historical novels and every attempt at "fictionized history." The author certainly did not intend her book as a strict scientific biography of Father De Smet. Consequently her publishers would have spared the author most of the adverse criticism which reviewers have meted out to it along with their praise, had they stated more openly and prominently that the book was "fictionized history."

To any one acquainted with the life of De Smet, it is at once evident, from the allusions in the book itself, that the author has made intensive research into the life of the great missionary and is thoroughly conversant with all of the strictly historical events of his varied career. In the main, from this abundance of material she has chosen particularly prominent events such as De Smet's efforts to get the missions started in the Bitter Root valley, his participation in the Fort Laramie Council of 1851, his remarkable peace expedition to the camp of Sitting Bull in 1868. These she has highly dramatized, filling in fictional dialogue, description and emotion. The net result of the application of her art of creative writing is a highly interesting and readable book, and one that will probably do more to make De Smet known and appreciated than anything that has yet been written about him. To those who would pry deeper into the history of the man—to separate fact from fiction—the book will act as an open door inviting them to examine the scientific and strictly historical accounts, of which there is no dearth.

Taking the book as the author intended it and for what it is—"fictionized history"—and keeping one eye on the authentic history of De Smet, the writer believes that the following observations are justified. The portrayal of Father De Smet's desire to pattern the missions of the Bitter Root valley on the model of the Paraguayan reductions as the dominating aim of his life is overdrawn. He did indeed desire segregation of the Indians from the whites, was told from Rome that the Paraguayan model had proved its value; but the idea did not so exclusively dominate his thoughts that its failure of realization crushed him so utterly. He was too much of a Jesuit and consequently too practical for that. Moreover his later letters reveal that he kept his same jovial disposition and retained his same characteristic enthusiasm for any and all work that would benefit the Indians.

Secondly, his influence over the Indian tribes at the time of the Fort Laramie Council, many portions of which he met there for the first time, is exaggerated. He had not yet reached the apex of his influence which eventually became so unique, though his participation in the Fort Laramie Council served to broaden his already great and consequently growing influence. Thirdly, the peace mission which De Smet undertook from Fort Vancouver in 1858-59, with the permission of General Harney, is left hanging in the air—the missionary's subsequent return to Fort Vancouver accompanied by Indian chiefs and the difficulties which grew out of this fact between Harney and the Indian department, as well as

the temporarily good results of his mission, being omitted. Again, the complete and easy assurance of the knowledge of the exact location of gold deposits by De Smet, though it has a basis in fact, has about it an aura of over simplification.

It is the writer's judgment that the portion of the book which has the least basis in authentic De Smetiana is that dealing with De Smet's life in St. Louis—the cholera epidemic, the great fire, the visit to the slave stockade, meanderings along the waterfront. It is really somewhat difficult to see why the author concocted all this, and what was gained by throwing in the episode of Sarah "of the frayed bonnet." It is the only thing in the book that smacks of bad taste.

A review of the present book by Avery Craven, Professor of History at the University of Chicago, in the *New York Herald Tribune*, is worthy of comment here since Professor Craven has some interesting things to say about the real history which forms the background of Miss Magaret's work. It is Miss Magaret's privilege, in a work of creative writing, to mix fiction with true history. But we can hardly extend that privilege to a professor of history in one of the country's leading universities when he undertakes a commentary on De Smet history in his capacity as a professor of history.

Not to misquote Professor Craven, here is his opening paragraph:

In 1831 two Flathead and two Nez Perce Indians came to St. Louis from the Oregon country with a white trader's pack train. They requested missionaries who would come and teach their tribes the white man's religion. This "cry from Macedonia" stirred the Methodist and Presbyterian Boards to send the Lees, the Spaldings, the Parkers and the Whitmans to establish missions in the Willamette Valley of Oregon. It moved the St. Louis Jesuits to send Father Pierre Jean De Smet to the Bitter Root Valley, where he established the Mission of St. Mary's for the Flatheads and later the mission of the Sacred Heart for the Coeur d'Alenes and of St. Ignatius's for the Pend d'Oreilles. All these missionaries displayed rare courage and endured with pious resignation the hardships of the frontier. Their missions contributed something toward softening the rough edges of a crude world. Their varying creeds confused the simple Indians and the vices of the "civilization" of which they were precursors weakened the tribes and brought the missions ultimately to ruin. Such are the uninspiring facts which the historians record.

It is introducing pure fiction and distorting history to lump De Smet's subsequent achievements and labors and successes on a par with that of the ministers sent out by the Methodist and Presbyterian Boards, simply on the ground that their commencement was occasioned by a common event. Father De Smet towers over the reverend gentlemen mentioned by as much as the Rockies rise above the Great Plains at their base. Moreover some of the names adduced have an unholy historical connotation. The long-current myth of Marcus Whitman's saving Oregon for the United States has been exploded into thin air, but the legend still bobs up occasionally. The subsequent role played by the Methodist Mission party (of which the above were the precursors) in robbing Dr. John McLoughlin of his rightful ownership of land, is the blackest chapter in the annals of American missionary effort, bar nothing.

There follows a summary of the mission work. "Such," writes Mr. Craven, "are the uninspiring facts which the historians record." This certainly can not be applied at least to Fr. De Smet. And the writer has just suggested the impropriety of lumping De Smet with the Protestant

gentlemen of the cloth. Later in his review, when Professor Craven has somewhat untangled De Smet from association with these gentlemen, he himself says "Father De Smet, even without literary assistance, was an interesting figure." And when Mr. Craven speaks of the vices of "civilization" bringing the missions "ultimately to ruin" he surely must be overlooking the very patent fact that De Smet's Jesuit successors are today caring for Indian missions in the far West on both sides of the Divide.

After the opening paragraph quoted above, the reviewer continues:

"Helene Magaret, poet but certainly not historian, has rejected these prosaic accounts [sic!] and has found in the career of Father De Smet material for an epic. Basing her narrative upon a none-too-reliable journal, she has allowed her imagination full play."

If Professor Craven were not a member of the history department of a highly respected university all that the above would call for would be the raising of the eyebrows and the astonished ejaculation, "Mr. Craven!" But since the case is otherwise, let us follow what we must call his reasoning and examine his logic. First, he unjustly squeezes De Smet into a group from which his personal history definitely excludes him; secondly, he briefly characterizes, again *in globo* (Their missions etc.), the contributions and results of the missions which, in as far as his blanket statement is intended to cover Father De Smet, is definitely false and wholly inadequate. This is supposed to bring him (and the reader with him) to the conclusion, "Such are the uninspiring facts which the historians record." Then by the process of allowing his own imagination full play the good professor leaps to a denial that Helene Magaret is an historian because she "has rejected these prosaic accounts." Actually right logic compels her to reject them, and she certainly would have been no historian had she acted otherwise. It would be infinitely interesting to read the book that Professor Craven (surely an historian himself) could write on Father De Smet, drawn from "these prosaic accounts" that do not apply to Father De Smet! This much seems certain, and without qualification: Helene Magaret gives ample evidence of being vastly better informed on the authentic history of Father De Smet than does Professor Craven.

It is not enough for the good professor to be irate because of the rejection of his "prosaic accounts," but ire is added to ire since the author has based her narrative "upon a none-too-reliable journal." If only the Chicago historian had definitely pulled this journal out of the mystery bag of anonymity its merits might be fairly examined. We know of no such journal. What we do know is that De Smet's unique history rests on the firm basis of authentic and absolutely reliable historical documents. They challenge scrutiny. And while argument is always somewhat unpleasant and frequently acrimonious, still if there is no other way of gaining De Smet the historical recognition which is his due and which has been so long denied him by American historians—for what reasons, let them answer themselves—then the writer respectfully submits that the sooner the gauntlet is flung down the better! If the career of Father De Smet does not furnish "material for an epic," then there is no

epic to be found in the panoramic history of the American west.

So much for the authenticity of the history which furnishes the background for the present volume, and upon which I base my quarrel with Professor Craven. A clear-cut distinction must be made unless we are willing to throw out the baby with the bath. With this demarcation in mind the writer has already made his own restrictions on the book. If Professor Craven had adhered more rigidly to this concept which he manifestly perceives, but does not always keep in mind in making his judgments, he would have been less free in his censures and more lavish in his praise for a book that is so clearly "fictionized history."

History in the Classroom

W. B. Faherty, S. J., M. A.

Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin

HISTORY is not only interesting in itself; it offers many means of augmenting this interest. Rare indeed is the grammar or algebra class that can be enlivened by the use of charts or maps. The essentials of Latin do not lend themselves to radio dramatization. The study of English grammar gains little from modern movies. But with history it is different.

Various are the helps the history teacher has at his disposal. Certain of these W. P. Donnelly, S. J., has pointed out: debates, historical dramas, improvised radio broadcasts, visits to local museums and historic sites.¹ I have found his suggestions on utilizing imagination in assigning work especially good. The students are to write diaries, letters, or newspaper accounts as if they were contemporaries of, or actors in, some great event of the past.

The majority of the boys, in my experience, have entered enthusiastically into such work; but few were able to catch the atmosphere of the times, or the attitude of the characters. I well remember one student who wrote in his diary as a private in the Civil War all the different opinions of the great generals and commentators as to how a certain battle should have been fought. A sophomore, on the other hand, wrote a letter to a foreign friend complaining about the Stamp Act with such a real chagrin that it seemed an actual letter of the Pre-Revolutionary era.

To these recommendations, I will add a few general suggestions. Use *blackboards* often. If you have something for the pupil to take down, write or have a pupil write it on the board, rather than dictate. Dictation is confusing, and boys are not accurate auditors unless the matter be the score of a football game or the earned run average of some popular pitcher.

Collect *pictures* from newspapers and magazines that illustrate topics in your course; in two years I gathered a collection that provides a pictorial description of every topic in American government. It is more impressive to see pictures, for instance of the Battlefield of Gettysburg, than merely to hear a verbal description of it. An incident that occurred at the time of the election of Pope Pius XII will illustrate the value of good historical pictures.

¹"Making History Interesting," in HISTORICAL BULLETIN, Nov. 1937, p. 11

I used this occasion to describe the government of the Church and the formalities of the papal election. Two classes, I thought, were sufficient. A day later one of the students asked to see a page of pictures from the daily paper illustrating the election. After ten minutes, he said, "I understand it at last." "Understand what?" I inquired. "All about the election you were trying to explain to us yesterday and the day before."

Movies can be a great help. Recently many movies have followed historical detail quite accurately, for instance "The Tower of London" and "Alexander Graham Bell," if I recall correctly. Others, while careful in some details, give a wrong general impression. The teacher should be ready, if he has opportunities of seeing historical movies, to point out fact and fiction.

Use *charts*. Purchase some, if you can; make others yourself. The chapter in European history on the changes in ideas of government can be charted by using parallel columns to set forth the teachings of various writers. On each line would be the attitude of the various systems toward a particular topic, such as property, education, type of rule and the like.

The importance of *anecdotes*, stories and quotations, needs no insistence. Books are to be found with lively well-written stories of our heroes, which can be used to stir up interest in a certain character or period. Chapters of full length biographies, likewise, can be read to introduce the book to the class. This should be done according to the method of a movie preview. An exciting episode should be chosen, one that will create a desire in the pupils' minds to read the book. Narrative poetry and verse attract the pupils, such as Kipling's "The Fuzzy Wuzzy" and "Gunga Din." Contemporary newspapers make interesting class-material, especially if the periodicals chosen give contemporary opinion on some disputed question, such as the Gettysburg Address.

Institute *comparisons*; point out situations in present day affairs that are similar to the historic questions being studied. Indicate events in their own lives that will help them to understand the past. A comparison of the partition of Poland in the eighteenth century with that of 1939, with which they are familiar, will impress the facts of that event on the minds of the students.

Follow the order of *ideas* rather than of time. In American history, for instance, study the Winning of the West in this fashion. Take the Louisiana Purchase, the development and annexation of Texas, the Oregon Question, the Gold Rush and similar topics as a distinct unit. In a succeeding unit take the controversies between the states, which cover a similar chronological period. When the inauguration of Lincoln is reached, you can go back and list the facts already studied, under the different presidential administrations. This is a much more satisfactory procedure than taking each administration as a unit in itself and giving all its divergent details.

Develop, as a sideline, an interest in *local history*. Men of importance in the past history of your city or district may have been forgotten. It would make a worthwhile class project to resurrect such a character. This would make an excellent project for the history club. Visit with your pupils sites of historical interest. Each locality has many.

Acquaint your pupils with historical *radio programs*, such as the "Cavalcade of America."

Demonstrate, unostentatiously of course, your *grasp* of the field of history which you are teaching. Knowledge impresses the students. Change your *position* from time to time. Sometimes stand at one corner of the room; another time at the desk; again at the blackboard. *Talk little!* Have the boys recite as much as possible. Use simple language. Employ *modern terminology* whenever possible. For instance, call Richelieu's fear of Hapsburg power a dread of 'a policy of encirclement,' or the alliance of Spain and Austria, the 'Vienna-Madrid Axis.' These present-day phrases will make those past events much more real to twentieth century Americans who follow contemporary European events so closely.

Map study is of major importance. A story is told of an English banquet in the spring of 1940, shortly before the Germans invaded Norway. During the course of the evening an Englishman said: "We ought to destroy the oil fields of Baku and Batun." A Roumanian responded that the British ought to take Narvik. Since no one else at the table had ever heard of Narvik, the subject was changed. If even Europeans don't know their own continent, how much less we!

Besides large maps for class demonstration, the teacher can draw other small scale maps. Comparison maps, such as Hitler's and Napoleon's conquests juxtaposed, and development maps, such as the growth of Prussia in the modern world, are especially interesting. Assign maps for the students. But, caution. If you have them draw the entire map, much time is consumed and with such strange results, that the desired objective is often not achieved. It is better to have them purchase outline maps, which are very reasonable in price.

Be ready both to answer *questions*, and to reject them: to answer them at the proper time, about the proper matter; to reject them, if these two qualifications are not met. Treatment in class of facts which can easily be looked up by the individual pupil, should be avoided; likewise questions on matter not yet handled in class. Surprisingly often a pupil will ask a question just answered. Then too, many pupils readily get the idea that they can ask questions any time they choose to do so. Train them to a set time for questions. In your daily schedule leave three or four minutes for question-time. If rushed, provide a time after class when you will be available for consultation. Usually pupils either will find the answer themselves, or will not consider their questions worthwhile enough to remain after class.

Be careful to avoid involved discussion, especially if it concerns itself with a problem in history not interesting or valuable to the entire class. Let the benefit of the majority be your criterion! At the same time, do not underestimate the great value of *discussion*; and when a discussion is in progress, cultivate the habit of listening. By allowing the boys to state their opinions the teacher can give them greater confidence in themselves, and can frequently point out errors or false opinions. Lastly, see that the discussion does not narrow itself to one or two boys; bring in as many as you can.

The *human element* should always be in the foreground. Amid the totalitarian theories and the earth-

shaking events of the present, the individual man has become hidden. War seems to be looked upon more and more by Americans, not so much as the heart-rending massacre of millions of people, but rather as a big project like the building of the Panama Canal. Men still make history, not machines and blind forces. Whether they drive a chariot or an eighty-ton tank, the men at the controls are composed of much the same heart and emotions. Powerful forces may surge up that seem to sweep unhampered like tidal waves; but remember, the Luthers, the Loyolas, the Washingtons, the Mirabeaus, the Napoleons, the Bismarcks still set these forces in motion, control them, or stem their advance.

The English Reformation

Sister M. Paul Fitzgerald, S. C. L., Ph. D.

Leavenworth, Kansas

THE English Schism sprang up and spread throughout the country with scarcely any opposition. To find the why of this fact I read Gasquet¹ and Constant² and was impressed and somewhat bewildered by their conflicting opinions on the following points: 1) Preliminary Cause of the Reformation; 2) Attitude of England toward the Papacy; 3) Spiritual status of the Clergy; 4) Attitude of the Laity toward the Clergy.

Gasquet pictures phases of the spiritual side of English life in the period immediately preceding the Reformation; on the other hand Constant's work is devoted mainly to the Schism of Henry VIII. Though these writers have treated distinct periods, their purpose in writing is fundamentally the same. Gasquet desired

by an examination of the literature of the period in question to extract evidence of the mental attitude of the English people towards the religious system which prevailed before the rejection of the Roman jurisdiction by Henry VIII. (p. 5)

Constant purposed to

discover what it was that allowed the king to meddle with the Church and the Reformation to spring up and develop on English soil. (p. 1)

In his first chapter Constant seeks to answer approximately the same problems that are discussed in five chapters of Gasquet's *Eve of the Reformation*. The following quotations indicate how divergent are the views of the two authors on the points cited in the first paragraph of this paper:

Preliminary Cause of the Reformation

GASQUET (p. 188): The work, both of raising the seed (of religious discord) and scattering it over the soil of England, must be attributed . . . to Germans and the handful of English followers of the German Reformation.

GASQUET (204-205): The special points of the traditional faith of the English people, which the reforming party successfully attacked, were precisely those which had been the battleground in Germany. . . . Tyndale described by More as the "captain of the English heretics," . . . [claimed] that all belief must be determined by the plain word of Holy Scripture, and by that alone. . . . [He] rejected all the Sacraments but two, . . . and the old teaching about Purgatory. . . . and with their denial of the priesthood quickly came their rejection of the doctrine of the Sacrifice in the Mass, and their teaching that the Holy Eucharist is a "token and sign" rather than the actual Body and Blood of our Lord.

CONSTANT (31): The Reformation began in England, not with the proclamation of some theological novelty, but rather with the destroying of the clergy's privileges and confiscation of the Church's property. The Reformation in this country was brought about solely by a grievance of a practical order intimately bound up with a question of money.

Attitude of England Toward the Papacy

GASQUET (71 and 74): Up to the very eve of the rejection of this supremacy (of the Holy See) the attitude of Englishmen, in spite of difficulties and misunderstandings, had been persistently one of respect for the Pope as their spiritual head. On the other (hand) . . . there was a dislike of interference in matters . . . they regarded . . . outside . . . Papal prerogative. It was not until . . . doctrinal reformers had succeeded in weakening the hold of Catholicity in religion on the heart of the people that the rise of national feeling entered into the ecclesiastical domain, and the love of country could be effectually used to turn them against the Pope.

CONSTANT (3, 6, 8 and 10): Feeling against the Papacy and the Church was deep-rooted in England. From William the Conqueror to the death of Edward III, for three centuries the Crown and Parliament elaborated a long series of decrees and statutes tending to restrain papal jurisdiction in England; these were a source of inspiration at the time of the Schism. In the fourteenth century William of Ockham (Surrey), a Franciscan theologian had denied the popes' supremacy over kings and had questioned the divine origin of the primacy of the Holy See. (Later in the same century) Wiclif . . . rejected the Pope's authority, saying there was no need for it, . . . it was not of divine origin but merely the result of historical evolution.

With the passing of time the bonds uniting England and Rome had weakened. For four centuries there had been no English Pope. . . . (England's influence in the Sacred College was limited to one member in a body of fifty or sixty members.) (The Church in England had but one link with Rome) the all-powerful Wolsey had secured his nomination for life as the legate of the Holy See.

Spiritual Status of the Clergy

GASQUET (127-130 and 247): That there were bad as well as good (clergy) may be taken for granted, . . . but that as a body the clergy, secular or religious, were as hopelessly bad as subsequent writers have so often asked their readers to believe . . . is disapproved by the tracts of both Saint-Germain and Sir Thomas More. . . . It is impossible that the clergy can have been universally immoral and the laity have remained sound, temperate, and loyal.

Simple, straight-forward teaching was not neglected in pre-Reformation England, and every care was taken that the clergy might be furnished with material . . . for . . . the fundamental religious teaching.

CONSTANT (18-20): The clergy in England laid themselves open to criticism. Country clergy, who lived the life of the yeomen farmers were ignorant and despised by the middle class. . . . Thomas More regretted the lack of discretion in choosing clerics and represented this as one of the chief abuses of the Church in England.

Higher clergy cared little about possessing the qualities necessary for their state. Since Henry VII's days a bishop had become a royal official drawing a pension from the Church's revenues; and continued to serve him (the King) at Court undertaking either embassies or diplomatic missions. His own diocese never saw him, except when he was worn out, aged or in disgrace. . . . In 1530 all episcopal sees save four belonged to non-resident or royal officials. . . . They were all ready for servitude, and so Henry VIII's task was simplified. (C. 18-20)

Attitude of the Laity Toward the Clergy

GASQUET (105, 121, 125, 135, 136): The anti-clerical spirit . . . was practically unknown only four or five years before 1533 and . . . originated undoubtedly from the dissemination of Lutheran views and teachings by Tyndale and others.

Sir Thomas More, thinks that the number of priests without very definite work had tended to diminish the respect paid to them by the laity. Another fertile cause of complaint against the clergy at this time was . . . the way in which tithes were exacted in many cases without consideration for justice and reason.

It was the Crown and not Commons that was hostile to them (the clergy). The petition of Commons against the spirituality really emanated from the Court and . . . the Lower House was compelled by direct royal influence to take the course indicated by the royal will. Four drafts of the petition existing among the State papers in the Record Office put this beyond doubt, as they are all corrected in the well-known hand of Henry's adviser, . . . Thomas Cromwell.

¹ G. Constant, *The Reformation in England*. New York. Sheed and Ward. 1934.

² Francis A. Gasquet, O. S. B., *The Eve of the Reformation*. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901.

CONSTANT (14-15 and 21-22): There was no love for the clergy. Laymen were ill-disposed towards them, Archbishop Morton remarked in Convocation in 1487, and advised preachers to abstain from censuring the abuses in their presence. Reginald Pole recorded that layfolk were beginning to detest the priests. The latter were blamed for refusing to bury people until they had received gifts for doing so, and for not administering the Sacraments when they were asked.

The anti-clerical feeling of part of the population was reflected in Parliament, especially in the House of Commons, which was elected by the industrial and business classes, chafing, as usual, under the religious yoke and ecclesiastical precepts. Wolsey dissolved the 1515 Parliament because of its attacks upon the clergy.

To summarize, Constant's conclusion seems to be this: In England there was a deep-rooted feeling against the Papacy and Church in general. This feeling was reflected in the anticlerical spirit of Parliament particularly the House of Commons and needed no compulsion from the King in an attack on Papal prerogative and clerical privilege. According to Gasquet the attitude of the English toward Papal authority was one of full and free submission in things spiritual with a tendency to question Papal prerogative in questions of mixed jurisdiction. The anti-clerical spirit was largely the result of Lutheran influence and was practically unknown until just a few years before the outbreak of the Schism. He contends that the Crown and not Commons reflected the anti-clerical spirit as the House of Commons by no means heartily supported the policy of the king in crushing the clergy. Gasquet quotes from books and tracts that stressed the qualifications of candidates for Holy Orders, or dealt with the efficacy of spiritual reading, meditation, and habits of study for those intending to be priests. That such books were written would seem to indicate that abuses existed in these matters. But, more important, it indicates a fundamentally healthy condition in which sincere efforts were made to counteract abuses and normal weaknesses.

The strong points of Gasquet and Constant's interpretations are found blended in a work by Janelle,³ whose analysis of religious conditions in pre-Reformation England goes deeper than that of either. Says Janelle:

The Henrician schism was directed less against the faith than against the jurisdiction of the Church; and on this point as attached as England seemed to be to the orthodox beliefs and to the Holy See itself, there could be traced a tendency in the opposite direction. A part at least of the population was irritated by the pretensions and power of papal administrative and ecclesiastical tribunals. There existed a popular anti-clericalism tainted by partiotism, hostile to the foreigner which Henry VIII would utilize to his profit (13).

In regard to the conditions of religious life in England, Janelle points out the differences between the second half of the fourteenth century and the fifteenth century. The one was marked by profound decadence, the other by manifestations of a genuine renewal of the faith, and especially of piety (13). There was a taste for exercises of devotion, but not for theological analyses and discussions. The public that formed the clientele of the printers, the lay public in great part who preferred English to Latin, never dreamed of giving intellectual expression to their religion. They felt it, lived it very simply and, one can say, very well (15). Since the beliefs of traditional religion were not menaced they saw no need of defending them.

³ Pierre Janelle, *L'Angleterre Catholique à la veille du Schisme*. Paris. 1935.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Church in England, whatever her hidden defects, seemed to be solidly established and to be sustained by the fidelity of almost all of her children (54).

Sinews of Peace

(Continued from page fifty-two)

America, for example, had all the world's gold; of course, she could lend it out to the poverty stricken nations and found a chain of currencies bound to the dollar like those formerly linked to the pound. Of course, she should lend it out to the undeveloped nations in loans with careful conditions attached which would yield a substantial control of the borrower's enterprise, a substantial revenue to the lender and, wherever it might be needful, an unimpeachable basis for moving in later to protect its nationals and their property.

If America had done these things, and if America had been willing to support a navy to police her commercial stations throughout the world, imperialistic Europe could have been reconstructed. But this America did not do. The volume of long term lending dwindled to nothing. Two nations, France and the United States, held the world's gold and refused to lend it to anyone. France's refusal to lend was a matter of careful policy; ours a matter of indifference and lack of policy. As a result the international gold standard which for a hundred years under British management had furnished a usable international price level became first an unstable and unreliable thing; and finally in the form of exchange restrictions, stabilization funds, blocked currencies, barter agreements and devaluations and revolutions, the monetary mechanism itself became an instrument of policy,—not a common standard but a means of outdoing one's neighbors.

The Sinews of Peace Break Down

America came out of the war in by far the soundest economic condition. For Europeans, America's course was obvious she could turn out manufactured goods at costs with which no one could compete. Clearly, the correct policy for her was to do what England had done in the same circumstances—lower her tariff walls and take in the world's goods on terms inevitably favorable to herself. America besides producing manufactured goods also had large supplies of cotton and grain, a factor which complicated matters; England in her free trade days lacked just such staples. But that did not do away with the necessity of America playing her part in the game. The world owed America money; therefore America should let down her tariff walls and allow nations to acquire balances here with which to pay their debts. This, however, was not done. The Fordney-McCumber Tariff of 1922 was the severest ever enacted, and the revision of 1930 made matters definitely worse. "The economic consequences of the Fordney-McCumber tariff were three-fold: it fostered the growth of monopolies in the United States, prevented Europe from paying her obligation to us in the form of goods, and brought reprisals from foreign countries." (Morrison and Commager, *Growth of the American Republic*, II, 532.)

But local policy alone did not dictate that tariff; from 1919 on tariffs the world over were more numerous and higher. The new states arising out of the war lived in a

frenzy of nationalism; self-sufficiency and "autarchy" were slogans that ruled the day. Prior to 1914 tariffs had been used as an instrument of national policy but on a long term basis. A nation announced a trade program and adhered to it for ten or twenty years or a generation; producers both within and without a country could rely upon that policy and adjust their cost and production schedules to it in the assurance that there would be no abrupt or drastic change. The direction of production was altered by such tariffs but production in the new direction was stable. After 1920 tariffs, like the monetary standard, were not in the nature of durable arrangements; they were flexible instruments with which to bargain for temporary advantage. Tariffs looked not to long term industrial development but to very short term benefits. The result of this has been two decades of utmost disorder in the field of international trade; not only did the volume of commerce diminish, but its direction and its terms became erratic and unpredictable. The business man made profits one year and suffered losses the next that bore no relation whatever to his efficiency or careful calculation. "Stabilization" plans in sugar, coffee, tin, rubber and grain kept supplies hovering over the market which could be released at any moment and nullify any degree of business acumen.

Many statistical evidences of this could be given; I will use only one which sets it forth in unmistakable form. We can regard the world as being composed of two great types of producers, manufacturing producers who are established in the populous areas and the producers of raw materials who are spread over the outlying districts. This division holds roughly both within a single country, e. g., the northeastern section of the United States, say north and east of St. Louis as opposed to the cotton fields of the South and the grain fields and mines of the west, and for the world as a whole, e. g., a small section of northwestern Europe and of North America as opposed to the rest of the world. If we make an index of the price of manufactured goods and of raw materials for the year 1913 and again for the years 1922 and 1933, we find that while the prices of manufactured goods are dropping in a range of 10%, prices of raw materials are dropping in a range of 50%. The primary producer simply could not buy the product manufactured out of the materials he furnished. This was a sharp reversal of the relation that had existed prior to 1914, when the processing of the raw materials produced in outlying districts was good business for both parties. By 1933 the post-war world suffered from a series of price schisms which made it impossible to do business. National price structures were walled off one from another; production costs, due to a currency policy, could not be brought into line, and a yawning gap separated primary producers from producers of manufactured goods. In the year 1933 the whole world stood idle by its work bench and its plow, possessed of the finest technical machine man had ever known, idle, unemployed, watching its assets dwindle. The sinews of the economic organism had snapped; all the national elements of prosperity and progress were at hand, but bonds uniting them had given way.

For four hundred years the western world had pursued a policy of aggressive nationalism, of an increasing

degree of unification and centralization on a nationalistic basis; it was pursued successfully first by France and then by England, and today that policy has reached its perfection in Germany. Nazi Germany is not a new development; it is the logical, inevitable and complete fulfillment of the forces of 1648, drawing all nations into an ascending spiral of concentrated authority and power to increase the strength of the state not for the benefit of the people but as an instrument of destruction.

Editor's note: Father Dempsey's discussion of the international scene is intended largely as an introduction to the more vital problems of economic concentration and industrial democracy. These will be discussed in the next issue of the BULLETIN.

Jesuit Notes

Raymond Corrigan, S. J., Ph. D.

St. Louis University

ASIDE from what may be called the institutional activity of the Jesuits, they were the educators of Christian, or, if you will, of Catholic Europe in a larger sense. As preachers, writers, scholars many of them were eminent in their own time, and are still influencing the thought of the present. One may cast a passing glance at their work in the mass as it were. Dr. Max Heimbucher, in his *Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, devotes over fifty pages to what is scarcely more than a long list of proper names of theologians, philosophers, historians, exegetes, ascetical writers, poets, mathematicians, astronomers, ethnologists, linguists and other literary and scientific scholars, to say nothing of saints, cardinals, bishops, royal confessors, preachers and missionaries. And this is a mere synoptic overview of Sommervogel's ten bulky quarto tomes¹ with their 11,000 writers and 120,000 published works. Granted that there are no Voltaires, Pascals or Rousseaus among these authors, the output is none the less impressive in its volume. And whether or not we accept Macaulay's dictum that the "name of a Jesuit on the title-page secured the circulation of a book," still the popular demand must have been sufficient to warrant the expense of publication; and whatever else may be said, every item in the endless catalog had to be good enough to pass a rigorous censorship which considered quality as well as orthodoxy.

But we can be more specific, and come down to three or four writers whose works and whose reputation are better known to the reader. It hurts to pass over the Bollandists and the sixty-five huge volumes which are only a part of their literary production during three centuries. Nor is it easy to slight Maldonado, Toledo, Petavius, Lessius, de Lugo, Rodriguez even, and a dozen others in different fields. But let us turn for a moment to two canonized saints, who have the added distinction of being Doctors of the Universal Church. Peter Canisius and Robert Bellarmine were, each of them, a power in their own day, and three hundred years later, in our day, their records stand so flawless that they have been awarded the highest degree ever given to mortal man. If we may add a third paragraph, it will go to Francisco Suarez, theologian, philosopher and political

thinker, the *Doctor Eximius* of the Neo-Scholastic revival.

St. Peter Canisius is ranked with St. Boniface as the Second Apostle of Germany. Three hundred years after his death devout Germans clamored for his canonization, while German universities presented learned petitions to prove that he deserved a place among the Doctors of the Church. Historians may deny, they have denied that Canisius was a "great man"; only ignorance can be blind to the magnitude of the task he accomplished. More than any other man, more than a dozen other leaders who might be named he incorporated in his own person the Catholic Reform in Germany. It has been said by a high authority that so far as the Fatherland was concerned the Catholic Reformation was, quite simply, Peter Canisius. It has been said that he was not a genius, not brilliant, not a literary artist. But he was an instrument that God could use (if I may say what I actually think and feel), or, to put the idea into more prosaic, less adequate words, what was lacking in flash and color was more than supplied by sheer power, by a driving personality whose apostolic zeal was fed by prayer and interior union with God. Talent, training, fidelity, and tireless energy may do more in the long run than the genius accorded to a few rare individuals. Canisius was calumniated, misunderstood, hated even, by those who felt the weight of his influence against the Reformation. In the circumstances this was a compliment. In more recent Protestant writings, however, we find greater fairness and something akin to admiration for the sheer goodness of a man who never had a hard word for his enemies.

But what did he actually do? One would hesitate to single out one or two or three achievements. Perhaps the most characteristic Jesuit feature about him, aside from his intense love for the Society, was the universality of his interests. He was an organizer whose activity was a major factor in the reform of the universities of Vienna, Ingolstadt, Freiburg im Breisgau and Cologne; he took over the university of Dillingen and made it a focal center of Catholic life; with the aid of bishops and princes he founded colleges at Ingolstadt, Prague, Munich, Innsbruck, Dillingen, Hall, Turnau and Freiburg, and lent his effective support to new foundations in Cologne, Augsburg and Würzburg; he set up student homes for rich and poor at Vienna, Dillingen, Munich, Ingolstadt and Innsbruck; he established seminaries at Prague, Fulda, Dillingen and Braunsberg; he was a distant promoter of the German College in Rome. And most of this work endured long after him. But Canisius was also himself in the teaching harness,—at least for a brief space. From professor of theology he became university rector and vice-chancellor, and from this he passed to the full-time job of provincial with the care of all the German Jesuits to occupy his attention during thirteen years. Meantime, he was called upon by bishops and princes for counsel, he was summoned to imperial diets, he acted as papal delegate in Germany and at the Council of Trent, he was the most successful and popular preacher at the courts of Munich and Vienna and in several cathedrals. And as if this were not enough, he found time to produce some thirty printed works. Of these his two huge volumes in answer to the Centuriators of Magde-

burg, though superseded by the monumental work of Baronius, are an index of the range of his literary zeal. But it was above all his Catechism, prepared for use on three scholastic levels, that made him the teacher of future ages. This clear, concise and practical explanation of Catholic doctrine saw two hundred editions during his lifetime and as many more since, and was translated into twelve languages. Whole generations knew the catechism as *die kleine Canisi*. Even von Ranke pronounced the little volume a masterpiece, while other non-Catholics have praised it highly. In Sommervogel the bibliography of Canisius is allotted thirty-eight quarto pages. Otto Braunsberger devoted thirty years to the congenial task of gathering his writings into eight bulky volumes, not the least important section of which contains his letters to prelates and civil rulers. But Canisius was more than a writer. He was a promoter of the press, who saw in the apostolate of the pen a vocation comparable to that of the foreign missionary.

His most competent critic has expressed what must be in the mind of all who know him. When one considers his work as preacher and catechist, writes Braunsberger, one would think he had nothing else to do; when one considers his writings and his efforts to promote literary enterprises, one would think again he had nothing else to do; when one recalls his influence on civic corporations, his counselling of princes and prelates, of emperor and popes one would think him a professional diplomat with no other occupation. But the image that lingers in the mind is Peter the traveler, familiar to all the great highways of the Empire, writing as he jogged over the rough roads with a lone companion from one mission to another, and all the while immersed in prayer and contemplation.

These notes were part of a longer article written for the Jesuit Quadricentennial. They will be continued as space permits.

Editorials

(Continued from page fifty-six)

has the experience, the savior faire and, above all, the zeal for imperiled souls, the grasp of eternal values and the intimate union with God which his unique position demands. Humanly speaking, we have reason to be happy in the kind of leader God has given us. But the historian has not yet the assurance which will come only with better historical perspective.

While we wait for the clearer view of the future we are glad to have any means of knowing the Pope better. In *The Pope Speaks* (Harcourt, Brace. \$2.75) twenty-five papal pronouncements tell the story of papal efforts for peace up to September, 1940. This is prefaced by a rapid over-view of Pius XII and from the pen of Charles Rankin, and followed by several encyclicals of his two predecessors. The central theme of the whole book is peace. No one will question its timeliness. The documents will retain their value though, of course, Pius XII will have much more to say about the troubled world. We could be somewhat critical of Mr. Rankin's one hundred and twenty pages. For example, his account of the Vatican broadcast at the time of the Austrian Anschluss may perpetuate an injustice. On the whole, however, the clear impression remains that the Pope is doing a mighty, if discouraging work for peace, and that he is doing it well.

Sources of Marxian Thought

(Continued from page fifty-four)

of historical progress, however erroneous be their conclusions and however gratuitous be their assumptions. They analyzed past changes, but especially were they interested in prognosticating the future.

The Manifesto

The *Manifesto* opened with a criticism of bourgeois and utopian economic theories. Then it proceeded to give an exposition of the communistic theory in the following general vein. The present turmoil between capitalists and proletarians is but a phase of the ancient struggle between the classes. History is nothing if it is not the outline of the way in which one class secured power in the state, only to be overthrown by another class. Now (in 1848), the struggle is between the aristocratic landlords and the middle class capitalists. But the factory system is increasing the power and wealth of the capitalist at the expense of the landed noble,⁸ and this system is bringing about the final downfall of the capitalist himself. For from its environment springs the proletariat, which will displace the capitalist from the place he is now winning from the noble. Thus does communism assert that the dialectic applies to history. The noble of the medieval manor was a thesis, the medieval town was an antithesis, and by interaction between the two there arose a synthesis, the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois capitalist, in turn, has become a thesis, whose antithesis is the laborer. The synthesis of this dialectic, Marx predicted, will be the proletariat state, and a world revolution will be the means of bringing about this synthesis. The factory system will put the greater part of the wealth in the hands of a few, while the majority of the people become landless and impoverished. The people, the great majority, will become class conscious, and the day will come when the many will dispossess the few to usher in a dictatorship of the proletariat, which will establish a classless society with all the means of production held in common.

The revolution itself is explained by Marx in the theory of Saint-Simon. The methods of production have changed from the manorial to the industrial technique; but the ideas of the manor-religion, the state, private property—have remained the same. In order to bring the world of mental conviction into harmony with the economic condition of society, the old ideas must go. The wrench from old to new will be brought about by the world revolution, an activity of violence, in which bourgeois morals, bourgeois institutions, and bourgeois oppression will be completely overthrown. The class struggle with its consequent hate and destruction takes on the aspect of a crusade for the progress of humanity. On the other hand, all forces whatsoever, as long as they resist such systematic violence, must be annihilated as hostile to the human race. The *Manifesto* ended with the now famous battle cry of communism, "The Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite!"

Marx and Engels, though seemingly fired with an unalterable conviction as to the worth of their program for world betterment, had serious difficulties in attempting to answer an obvious question. "How will the abolition of private property do away with the evils of industrial production? The machine is here to stay. Someone must manage, someone must do manual labor. How will the destruction of capitalism do away with the possibility of the communistic factory manager's exploiting of labor?" In 1848 Marx and Engels could not answer this question. Hegel, Strauss, Bauer, Feuerbach, Proudhon, Saint-Simon, Von Stein, and the evolutionary spirit of the Darwinian era in science⁹ had brought them a long way toward their goal of Scientific Socialism, but it was not until they had come under the influence of English thinkers that they began elaborating scientific arguments in support of their theories.

British Influence

During the age just prior to the industrial revolution men were of the general conviction that all economic activity was governed by certain fixed laws which could not be interfered with by men. The Physiocrats of the eighteenth century claimed that there existed a Rousseauvian *ordre naturel* in economics and they were the forerunners of classical economy, thus giving this idea of a law popular vogue. Locke and Hobbes both believed that such a law existed;¹⁰ but the true successors of the Physiocrats were Adam Smith (better, perhaps, regarded as a contemporary) and Ricardo. Striving to free economic activity from the trammels of governmental interference, Smith reiterated the physiocratic concept of law, but, unlike his predecessors, he set down self interest as the fundamental of economic law. He argued that when man is allowed to pursue his ends, unmolested and when in a free, open market the laws of economics hold full sway the system functions at complete efficiency. He concluded that a policy of *laissez faire* should obtain, that government should refrain from all regulation of economic activity. Smith claimed that under *laissez faire* all prices would be just,¹¹ since labor would be a determinant of the price in a free market. It is of no importance for the purpose at hand to examine Smith's reasons for this conclusion. It is important, however, that Smith declared labor to be a determinant of value,¹² but only one of the determinants; rent from land, and profit from investment are the others. He stated that in primitive society labor was the sole determinant of value, rent and profit being unknown, and that in early times labor was the measure of value. Thus we find the first great economist of capitalism playing right into the hand of the founder of capitalism's most powerful enemy, communism. Smith agrees with Marx in the latter's contention that property rights and land rights are not natural, but rather institutions of an artificial kind. Modern anthropological evidence is entirely against this conclusion, as is the certain proof from philosophy of the natural right of private ownership of property; but,

⁸ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (New York, 1935), 15

⁹ H. V. Routh, *Money, Manners, and Morals* (New York, 1936), 168

¹⁰ Rudolph Eucken, *Main Currents of Modern Thought* (London, 1912), 206

¹¹ Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, Cannan's Edition, I, vi, 32

¹² *Ibid.*, 49

in conceding such a conclusion Smith paved the way for the communist's answer to capitalism.

Ricardo, who succeeded Adam Smith as the economic theorist of capitalism, also gave great inspiration to Marx. Ricardo, heir to the penurious philosophies of Hobbes, Locke, and Hume, was less inclined to give credit to the human will than was Smith. Consequently we find him attempting to deal with economic values, market prices, without any deference for what economists call utility, that is, human wants and volition. Failing to take human volitional power into consideration and simultaneously attempting to reduce all calculation of value to one determinant, he limited the amount of value a thing possessed to a quantity in direct proportion to the amount of labor that went into its production. Thus he distinguished between "market-value" and "quantity-of-labor-value," but he also assumed that the latter alone is real, since he refers to it as the determining element in all value, eliminating utility or human volition.

Marx and Engels thought that the capitalistic economists were in an anomalous position. Their system demanded the stable foundation of private property, yet their assumptions were a tacit denial of any such foundation; capitalism was based on a profit system, but the founders of communism thought Smith and Ricardo proved that profit was exploitation. Ricardo had concluded that, since value was determined by labor alone, all wealth was a store of labor¹³—a millionaire merely had a million dollars worth of labor in the bank. Marx seized upon this proposition and developed it to its logical conclusion, a conclusion that has since become the frenzied cry of every communist agitator the world over: "Profit is the exploitation of the worker." It is easy to see how he came to think so; for if Ricardo were correct, if the price of a thing equals its labor content, anyone who profits by the sale of a thing, does so by either overworking or underpaying his employees, thus creating a margin of profit for himself. In other words, under the assumptions of Ricardo labor would be entitled to receive in wages an amount equal to the price its product brings on the market,¹⁴ since under the assumptions of Ricardo a thing is worth no more than the labor it contains. *Laissez faire* economic theory is the product of Smith and Ricardo, but the chief economic tenet of Marx has its inspiration from the same source. Marx spent many years of study in an attempt to prove his theory of value. *Das Kapital* was written with this end in view because, unless his theory of value is granted, his whole system of historical interpretation and world revolution falls under its own weight.

With this, communistic theory reached its last stage of development, and the time was ripe for communistic activity, for revolt against the things the theory holds to be false. Marx and Engels now believed that the clamorings of the *Manifesto* could be backed up with scientific evidence. Profits exploit labor. To keep his profits the industrial exploiter of labor needs private property, the storehouse of labor. The church and the state are the bulwarks of private property. Hence, church and state must be done away with so that private property will be

no more. According to communists, when private property is destroyed, the exploitation of the worker will no longer be possible. They admit that factories are here to stay, that some must labor with their hands, that others must be managers. But with the abolition of private property, the one who manages industry will find himself unable to keep any profit he might gain by exploitation; in the face of such a futility he will not be willing to overwork or underpay labor. This is, no doubt, a rather naive conclusion after the three volumes of intricate analysis contained in *Das Kapital*, but it is the driving force of the communists today.

Communism is eclecticism which for sheer audacity in adopting, combining, and making its own of a large number of varied philosophies and theories is unsurpassed in modern philosophical and scientific thinking. None of its fundamental theory is the product of its own thinkers. All of its ideas spring from inspirations provided by minds in no way associated with the communist's outlook. It must be admitted then, that, except for the dexterity and finesse with which he fitted together the theories and philosophical idiosyncrasies of a dozen other men, Marx made few original contributions to communistic philosophy. His chief asset in the tremendous eclecticism he effected was a genius for demanding consistency in the thinking of those he studied and read. By demanding consistency he forced seeming antagonists to ally themselves with him in establishing the communist system. The positivist and evolutionary traits of the age were a great help to Marx, and for an obvious reason. Practically all of the popular thinkers of the period denied the possibility of metaphysics and were also loath to go beyond the forces of history and custom to explain human rights. Thus all the thinkers whose theories were used by Marx in shaping communism were committed to the path that leads to materialism and economic determinism. These nineteenth century philosophers, in their failure to understand man as a free creature of God, presented Marx with that wealth of material he needed to build a philosophy of life that makes man a mere plaything of material forces with a purely temporal destiny.

Our Book Review service is steadily expanding. We are rarely forced to delay publication of a review. At the moment our chief regret is the withholding of an excellent appraisal of Bernhard Knollenberg's *Washington and the Revolution* (Macmillan). We feel somewhat partial to University presses (California, Chicago, Fordham, Harvard, Oxford, Princeton and a few others), whose books have to wait their turn.

History must be our deliverer not only from the undue influence of other times, but from the undue influence of our own, from the tyranny of environment and the pressure of the air we breathe . . . it promotes the faculty of resistance to contemporary surroundings by familiarity with other ages and other orbits of thought. Lord Acton

Modern history is, next to Theology itself, and only next in so far as Theology rests on a divine revelation, the most thoroughly religious training that the mind can receive. Bishop Stubbs

¹³ David Ricardo, *On The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* (London, 1819), chapter III, part one

¹⁴ Karl Marx, *Das Kapital* (London, 1930), I, 165-180

Recent Books in Review

The Kingdom of Scotland: A Short History, by Agnes Mure Mackenzie. New York. Macmillan. 1940. pp. xii + 384. \$3.25

The range of nationalistic historical literature for any given country is practically coextensive with the diversified sentiments of patriotism entertained by its citizens. At one extreme stands a class of writers whose bristling chauvinism nauseates all except their fellow fanatics; at the other is a group no less loyal and devoted yet possessed of an ability to portray their nation's past with restraint and forbearance as well as with profound conviction and ingratiating charm. Miss Mackenzie occupies a prominent position in this latter school of historians.

The present volume recounts the history of Scotland from the time of Agricola down to the beginning of World War I. It is a digest of her imposing *History of Scotland* (the sixth and final volume is now in preparation) which has won the generous praise of critics for its rare combination of scholarship and brilliant, vigorous expression. Throughout the book Scotland is dealt with as one of the kingdoms of Europe, and in the epilogue is voiced the fervent aspiration that the nation may one day regain that status under the British Crown. Owing obviously to the limitations of space, certain provocative judgments which challenge traditional interpretations are not fully substantiated, but, as the author explains and this reviewer has found, satisfactory proofs are presented in the larger work.

CLARENCE J. RYAN.

Adversity's Noblemen, The Italian Humanist On Happiness, by Charles E. Trinkhaus. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. 172. \$2.00

No one can deny that this small work treats matter which is of great interest and significance to the student of European history, medieval, renaissance, or early modern. But unfortunately it raises more problems than it solves. Consequently, it is a book which arouses interest but leaves disappointment. These statements are not made in any particular mood of criticism, but only as a comment upon the obvious. The work is, apparently, a doctoral dissertation written under the direction of Professor Lynn Thorndike and does not pretend to be a definitive monograph upon the subject.

Doctor Trinkhaus has given us a study of the Italian humanist's concept of happiness. The usual impression given in the standard accounts is, as Doctor Trinkhaus states, that the humanist was a rollicking individualist, thoroughly enjoying the *this-world*, casting off the "medieval" obsession of the essential evil of created things. Doctor Trinkhaus blames Burckhardt for this view and shows that it was the result of his incomplete knowledge of renaissance culture; for Burckhardt considered only the "polite" literature of the period and neglected the "theoretical" moral literature. As the book goes on to show, the medieval concept of happiness did not reject the joys of this world. On the other hand, there was a very measurable amount of gloom in the humanistic picture. Doctor Trinkhaus blames this false interpretation of renaissance humanism upon Burckhardt's projection of his own nineteenth-century Nietzscheism into the Quattrocento. But may we suggest that Burckhardt was also falling into an error common to many scholars, namely the identification of medieval religion with Calvinism.

The main body of the book is devoted to the consideration of the problem of happiness in the moral writings of many humanist writers, and a final chapter is concerned with the problem of the origin and genesis of these ideas. The author does well in presenting *most* of the possible solutions to this set of problems, but he has little to tell us with any degree of assurance. While the author's scholarly caution is to be commended, the fact that so many unsolved problems are left hanging robs Doctor Trinkhaus' work of any pretense to definitiveness. In the opinion of the reviewer there are two possible lines of solution which the author has not sufficiently considered. First, more consideration should be given to the influence of the cultural background of these humanists, both to the pagan classical models which they so much enjoyed and to the Christian Humanism which stems from the Fathers and was the dominant cultural influence in Western Europe well down into the twelfth century. A better understanding of this continuous cultural stream might throw considerable light upon Italian humanistic moralizing. Secondly, the real nature of happiness itself should be considered, for it

should not be surprising that a true philosophy of happiness should find its echo repeated again and again in various ages. Too much should not be attributed to peculiar environmental conditions of culture!

This work, short and incomplete as it is, deserves recognition as an historical revision and as a first step in the direction of a better understanding of the Renaissance along a specific line. Owing, however, to its incompleteness, it will be read only by the specialized scholar. We look forward to a more finished work from the pen of Doctor Trinkhaus in the future!

R. L. PORTER.

Social Wellsprings, Fourteen Epochal Documents by Leo XIII, edited by Joseph Husslein. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1940. pp. xiii + 284. \$2.50

Students have often felt that the papal encyclicals were badly in need of a little stream-lining. Here we have a successful yet duly conservative attempt to meet the need. For many years Father Joseph Husslein has ranged over the wide, rolling and poorly charted field of Catholic social study. He has written books and pamphlets, lectured on the public platform and in the more prosaic classroom, conducted graduate seminars, organized and reorganized his own school of sociology. He knew how necessary it was to modernize, to some degree at least, the Ciceronian periods of Leo XIII, to break down sentences and paragraphs, to refurbish the weak and often insipid phrasing of earlier hurried translations, to provide an introductory setting for each encyclical, to render the hard road to wisdom less painful by a generous insertion of marginal titles and by judicious italicizing, in a word to serve up a wholesome repast in more appetizing form. As an editor of long experience he possessed all the technical equipment which his task demanded. The efficient collaboration of his publisher has aided him in the production of a volume that many will want to buy.

The obvious purpose of the compiler was to produce a practical volume. There is nothing in the nature of things to determine the choice of exactly fourteen "epochal documents" nor of exactly any amount of comment. The critic could waste his time suggesting expansion or contraction. The plain fact is that we have here a usable collection around which a teacher can easily build a semester's work. Also, the book may lure many a serious reader to spend a few studious evenings close to the sources of truth which the world is struggling to ignore. We hope the success of this experiment will induce the editor to do a second volume for Leo's successors.

R. CORRIGAN.

Historical Records and Studies, XXXI. New York. United States Catholic Historical Society. Volume XXXI. 1940. pp. 176

Perhaps there is nothing that surprises a delver into the lives of the saints more than the infinite variety of the genera and species of torture to which these good people have been compelled to submit. Sister Mary Christina Sullivan, in *Some Non-Permanent Foundations of Religious Orders and Congregations of Women in the United States (1793-1850)*, adds a species to that infinity. Here we have hosts of saintly women cast about over the wide reaches of pioneer America, like doves in a diluvial torrent, unable to find a place of rest. But Sister Christina, whose paper is more than half the present book, allows herself no time to sympathize or to speak in figures. She lists the convents (and their founders) that began to be and failed in various dioceses as far apart as New Orleans, Baltimore, and Oregon City. Should St. Louis complain or rejoice that Missouri, which might contribute something to the story, is omitted? Illinois is here in force, Kaskaskia and Cahokia. Sister Mary Lucida's Congregation of St. Joseph is followed almost verbatim for Cahokia's catastrophe, the great flood of 1844. But she did not write "The Sisters took refuge in the second story of their convent, where they watched the little Cahokian church . . . disappear in the torrent." Sister Lucida wrote "almost disappear", because when she was penning the story that same little church was still standing almost in view of her convent in Carondelet.

Some twenty years ago the historian of Detroit, C. M. Burton, was calling for help in his search for traces of the scattered "Poor Clares of Detroit of 1833 or thereabout." Sister Christina

has found them, found them in various localities, and solves most of their mysteries. She heals more fractured chronology and performs other remedial work in this narrow field than many Ph.D.'s combined accomplish in general practice.

"Four Women Lay-Apostles of the Old Northwest," by Sister Rosalita, I.H.M., is a touching account of the lives and labors of four associates of the celebrated Father Gabriel Richard: Angelique Campeau, Elizabeth Williams, Elizabeth Lyons, and Monique Labadie. Their story coincides with and well supplements the "Non-Permanent Foundations". Our Catholic happiness of today is buoyed up on a flood of tears of the heroic souls of yesteryear.

There is a brief article on "Universities" over the name of this reviewer. He wrote no article on Universities. He regrets to seem even remotely to sponsor such a line as the following: "Georgetown is the only publicly recognized university in the United States." The date of this statement is 1833. Shades of John Harvard, Old Eli, and ye other colonials, hold your ears! Reverence for the high authority who is said here to have made the above—let us say—inaccuracy, forbids us to write his name.

Mr. Thomas F. Meehan contributes "The First Catholic Monthly Magazines", "Pius IX and the Confederacy", "A Dutch Irish Pact, 1680," and nine pages of timely "Notes and Comments". The "In Memoriam" of Frederick J. Fuller and Dennis C. Fauss is fine history. Here are two Catholic laymen of whom the Church in America may well be proud. Happily now we do not have to wait a century or two to gather small fragments of their records.

L. J. KENNY.

Frontiers of the Northwest, by Harold E. Briggs. New York. Appleton-Century. 1940. pp. xiv + 629. \$5.00

This volume is a definitely valuable addition to the historiography of the Upper Missouri Valley. Dr. Briggs, writing from the abundance of fifteen years of research, has packed this work with all sorts of interesting and useful information. Each of the frontiers: that of the miner, of the buffalo, of the cattle-rancher, of the sheep-rancher, of settlement and of agriculture, is shown in its many sided life—from its beginning until its passing. Almost everything that has to do with each new frontier development, whether it be, for example, the variety theatre, the newspaper, or even the price of a bushel of beans in a mining camp store has been gathered and correlated.

The importance of the buffalo to white and red men, and its eventual near-extinction; the rise in power and influence of the early cattle associations; the gradual growth of the sheep business, and the struggle between herder and cattleman for the range; the story of land speculation and town-booming and building; the struggles of the farmer, and the oscillations of his fortunes are all adequately described.

This book is not meant for light and romantic reading of the "glamorous, wild and woolly West." It is a scholarly, yet not heavy study which because of its documentation, wealth of information, evident authority, numerous illustrations and many fine maps will be of service to anyone interested in the early history of that part of the United States which stretches from the Dakotas to Idaho and from Colorado to Montana. MARTIN HASTING.

Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711-1775, by Irving Mark. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. 237. \$3.00

To this reviewer, Mr. Mark's monograph stands as convincing proof that, far from being a subject which is gradually becoming exhausted, the colonial period of our North American history will long continue to afford plentiful material for interesting and enlightening treatment. That there were conflicts between classes in the seaboard colonies is a fact well known, and only too often historians have taken the easy way-out in explaining them—conservative *vs* radical, or rich *vs* poor, or upper *vs* lower class. Such these conflicts were, basically. Too little attention has been paid, however, to their deeper roots. It is to just such a task that Mr. Mark addresses himself in his monograph. He limits his field, as is correct when one is doing a type of work that may be considered pioneering. Yet his findings in regard to the agrarian conflicts of the eighteenth century in the Hudson Valley will prove not only interesting in themselves, but should also prove a source of stimulation and a guide for other similar studies. New Jersey had its agrarian problem, and so did the Carolinas. Perhaps Mr. Mark himself will follow up this line of research and produce the further studies which are now made all the more desirable by the taste of the present work.

JOHN F. BANNON.

Historic Americans, by Elbridge S. Brooks. New York. Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1940. pp. 467. \$2.50

This volume contains pen-sketches of thirty-one famous Americans beginning with John Winthrop and ending with Thomas Edison. Written in 1899 by Elbridge S. Brooks, it is now re-edited with five new chapters by his daughter Geraldine Brooks. The treatment is not that of a historian but of a journalist writing to stir up patriotic sentiments. Each account begins with a dramatic scene from the life of the man treated and ends with a brief sketch of the high points in his career, the whole being written more in the spirit of a panegyric than of an essay. Elementary and high school teachers will find the book helpful in arousing the interest of their students.

CHARLES J. MEHOK.

Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy, by Kurt von Fritz. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. ix + 113. \$2.00

In the middle of the 5th century B. C., in all the important Greek cities of Southern Italy except Tarentum there was a general revolution resulting in the disappearance from public life of a great number of political leaders, all of them members of the Pythagorean fraternity. This brought to a sudden close an important and remarkable phase of ancient history, around which much legend grew up in later years, and in modern times a learned controversy. This brief book, attractively produced and well indexed, is a carefully reasoned presentation of the whole problem, and a statement of what can be affirmed toward its solution, whether as certain, probable, or a clear issue for further elucidation. Its finest merit, indeed, lies in this scrupulous disentanglement of the evidence into these very different categories.

The author reviews, and with considerable acumen criticizes all the earlier studies on the subject—and they are surprisingly numerous. By comparison, counter-play, critical analysis, and tabulation of the sources in parallel columns, he seeks to filter fact from legend and error, and to reconstruct the recorded events and their definite chronological limits. The conflicting accounts of the main sources—Aristoxenus, Dichaearchus, Timaeus, Iamblichus, and Polybius—are thereby reduced to order in a more satisfactory way than hitherto. By the aid of numismatic evidence, it then becomes possible to outline Pythagoras' own life, with the dates of his sojourns in Egypt, Babylonia, Greece, and Italy, and to fix his birth at 589 B. C. and his death at 490. The fortunes of his "order" in Italy are similarly determined—the beginnings at Croton c. 530, the anti-Pythagorean rebellion at Cylon in the early fifth century, the great revolt and burning of numerous Pythagorean leaders in the house of the athlete Milo in Croton between 450 and 440, and final exodus of the society from Italy c. 390. By an apt analogy with Freemasonry in the 18th Century (of course without its baneful influence), the puzzle of how the political affairs of Southern Italy could be controlled by a few men of a sect not in itself political or strong, is at last cleared up.

These are valuable contributions to an intricate bit of history. The author's sane and comprehensive approach is evident. But his book is not easy to read. It presupposes familiarity with the ancient sources in context, and with the stages of the modern controversy over them. An analytical table of contents, or a clear summary of residual conclusions would have added much to the study's utility and clarity. And alas, many historians will be embarrassed by the author's fine compliment to their education, in printing the crucial quotations from the Greek sources without translation.

RAYMOND W. SCHODER.

The Origin of Printing in Europe, by Pierce Butler. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1940. pp. xvi + 156. \$1.50

In this small book on the origins of printing the author has included a useful and authoritative introduction to the cultural significance and basic technique of the art. In his treatment of the former it is encouraging to see not only a list of the blessings that derive from the invention of printing—this has long been standard equipment in the armory of the crusaders for Progress—but an intelligent statement of the price the same invention has exacted, more especially in the development of a thoroughly uncritical reading public and the diminution of genuine intellectual competence in a world of specialists and technicians.

That part of the book, the latter half, which treats properly of the origins of printing, advances new conclusions, particularly about Gutenberg's work, which will be valuable to students of typographical history and to bibliographers, but it suffers from too great compression. The knotty Fust-Gutenberg legal troubles are not clearly disentangled, and, in the absence of footnotes

the reader must solve the problem of Opilio and Peter Schoeffer (who, of course, are one and the same individual) either by a chance reference to the index or by his knowledge of Grimm's Law and of Renaissance practices of personal nomenclature. This latter part of the book makes far greater demands on the reader's background than the first. We can await expectantly for more detailed treatment in the subsequent publications at which Mr. Butler hints in his preface.

The illuminating discussion of the word "invention" and its cognates might take into consideration the longstanding and—in the fifteenth century—well-known rhetorical meaning of the term which undoubtedly exercised its influence on the meanings considered here. A revision of the present book might also profitably include a more detailed description or annotated diagram of the Moxon type mold, the present treatment of this apparatus being the only part of the discussion of printing techniques which is not entirely clear.

WALTER J. ONG.

An Introduction to Hispanic American History, by Tom B.

Jones. New York and London. Harper & Brothers. 1939. pp. 577. \$3.50

Mr. Jones has not set out to write a profound work. He wished to write an introduction to Hispanic American history, and he has succeeded admirably. The division of the work is good—the short "half" being devoted to the background, the period of conquest and of colonization, and the revolution, while the longer "half" turns on the developments of the nineteenth and then of the twentieth centuries. In the treatment of the colonial period Mr. Jones has furnished some excellent and succinct analyses of Spanish colonial institutions, which are extremely valuable. On one or other point of fact or interpretation we might be inclined to quarrel with him, but in general the presentation is correct and fair. We do, however, feel that José de Gálvez should be exculpated—he carried out the royal order expelling the Jesuits; he was hardly the one who "recommended" the same. The same fine spirit of analysis and synthesis characterizes the author's treatment of the National Period. The first chapter of each of these last two sections is an excellent survey. Occasionally in speaking of the Church the author's statements suffer from a lack of fuller information or, perhaps to put it better, from misinformation. For example, we are not quite as certain as the author would seem to be, that the attitude of the Mexican government which framed the Constitution of 1917 was "not anti-religious." But, a few criticisms apart, the author has written a very serviceable survey, well adapted both for classroom use and for the purposes of the interested general reader.

JOHN F. BANNON.

The Illinois, by James Gray. New York. Farrar and Rinehart. 1940. pp. 355. \$2.50

The country drained by the Illinois has played a very romantic and real part in the American story. Great figures of the colonial and national period have traversed the regions of the calm and determined "mighty crooked water"; Marquette and Joliet, La Salle and Tonty, Douglas, Lincoln and Grant. Illinois, Iroquois, French, British and American pioneers explored, traded and fought up and down its valley. In its long life, the river has serenely drifted by while wilderness tangles and rude Indian villages became well-planned farms and prosperous cities.

The author of this very readable contribution to the *Rivers of America* series has captured the real spirit of the Illinois country. He portrays it for us with vivid, striking, yet natural vigor. We catch ourselves roaring with the wild Clary's Grove boys as they black each other's eyes and roll drunks downhill in barrels. We feel inspired by the calm sense of duty and determined courage which caused Elijah Lovejoy to sacrifice his life for what he thought was a righteous cause. Judge Davis, Ward Hill Lamon, Joseph Gillespie, Peter Cartwright, "unknown" John Roberts, and Steamboat Elsie live and move before us.

Though the author, generally, has been commendably correct in his historical interpretations, he has allowed a few inaccuracies to slip in. One should not make the unqualified statement that the Spanish explorers were content with "rugged but rudimentary gestures toward salvation" in their relations with the Indians. There are many instances to the contrary. Then too, Mr. Gray has evidently fallen heir (unwittingly, we pray) to a perverse "Jesuit legend." The early Jesuits of North America have been accused of such things as wanting "the fur trade all to themselves," but recent scholarly studies have laid these ghosts once and for all—we hope. It will certainly be news and a blow to the Jesuit to know that his is "a comfortably indirect approach to God." We can forgive the author for this, because we feel he was speaking more from a lack of knowledge than from anything else.

MARTIN HASTING.

A History of the Catholic Church, IV, by Fernand Mourret. Translated by Newton Thompson. St. Louis. B. Herder. 1940. pp. x + 740. \$4.00

Thirty years ago Fernand Mourret began publication of his very readable *Historie générale de l'Eglise*. In 1925 the work had run into nine volumes and had carried the story down to the death of Leo XIII. A tenth volume seems to have been projected. Mourret shows a mastery of the best secondary literature, especially of the very abundant French writings on the subject, and he has done considerable research into the deeper sources of nineteenth century history. For the general reader as well as for the ecclesiastical student he has provided a vast amount of history in entertaining form. During the past ten years Father Newton Thompson has been bringing out a quite acceptable English translation. Beginning with volume five and then reverting to volume one, he has now completed more than half of the work.

The methodical reader may prefer to begin with the first volume. For one who has the time to spare we should recommend this procedure. But it is in no way necessary. The volume under review makes a fairly complete story. In the original French it has a separate title, *la Chrétienté*. Starting with the degradation of the papacy in the iron age of the tenth century, it portrays the ascent of the spiritual power up to the glorious triumphs of the greatest of the Christian centuries. Great princes and great popes, bishops and monks, scholars and above all saints led the living Church from the "monstrous regiment" of Marozia and the Theodoras through the struggles of Gregory VII and Alexander III to the nearly complete hegemony of Innocent III. The vital forces generated at Cluny and Clairvaux and in the rising mendicant orders are the spiritual counterpart of other forces at work in the crusades, the youthful communes and the universities. Above all, this was a period of growth, of life and energy. From the desperate need of an imperial protectorate to the desperate struggle with a strangling feudalism to the full-blown Catholic organization of the thirteenth century the movement was steadily upward. There is little on the surface to indicate that the germs of dissolution are preparing darker days ahead. The volume ends with Boniface VIII. The defects we might point out will be obvious to the intelligent reader.

R. CORRIGAN.

American History Since 1865, by George M. Stephenson.

New York. Harper. 1940. pp. x + 682. \$3.50

In this volume Professor Stephenson has succeeded in telling the story of American History during the past seventy-five years in both an interesting and a scholarly manner. His interpretation of the story is such as to stimulate thought on the part of the reader. Particularly interesting are his summaries of the labor question in its various stages of development, and of the life of the people in general. His sketch on the development of popular religious thought is well done. Such a sketch is not always to be found in other books of general history. His recognition of the Catholic Church as a factor in the development of American life, as has been pointed out by the reviewer of his earlier volume, demonstrates his acquaintance with facts which other historians are generally apt to overlook.

In writing about the more recent events from 1910 down to the present day Professor Stephenson has the disadvantage of being a contemporary. Probably his will not be the *last word* on the New Deal, nor even on Wilson and the World War. In all events his view is worthy of consideration though all readers may not share his enthusiasm for some particular policy or administration.

URBAN J. KRAMER.

English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism,

by Bruce Tiebout McCully. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. 418. \$4.50

British imperialism in India is a topic about which many sweeping generalisations are made, and English education in that vast country, or rather the lack of it, has been particularly castigated by many whose knowledge of the problems involved is of the slightest. This book deals with the history of English education from the beginning of the nineteenth century down to 1885, when the first Indian Nationalist Congress was summoned. It is an achievement when an author can write an intelligible account of what happened in those years, when both British and Indian counsels seemed so hopelessly divided internally, and can make clear the nature of the conflicts that were waged between the adherents of the old and the new.

The East India Company was not in favour of educating the people of India, nor did it want missionaries to go to the country; but in 1813 as a result of the agitation of Wilberforce, Grant and

the Clapham sect an East India Act was passed which the company reluctantly, and from somewhat base motives, accepted. Three years later the first college for English education was established at Calcutta under the sponsorship of a rationalist and a philanthropist. In the 'thirties' missionary colleges began to flourish, but it soon became evident that the students were drawn almost exclusively from the middle class and that their motives were mercenary. The more the professions, especially law, became overcrowded the more the educated turned to politics and to the press to bring about the reforms they desired, though down to the summoning of the first Congress there was no hint of revolutionary doctrine in the writings of the critics of British administration.

Dr. McCully has carried his point, that Indian nationalism was a by-product of English education, and he has made a very useful contribution to the history of British India. His work is well documented and the bibliography is extensive and thorough.

H. H. COULSON.

Three Centuries of American Hymnody, by Henry Wilder Foote. Harvard University Press. 1940. pp xi + 418. \$4.00

It is sometimes said that Protestantism is dead in America or that at least it has ceased to be a religion. The present volume in ten chapters enlarges on five lectures that were given at the Harvard Summer School of 1936. The first chapter reviews the history of Psalmody up to the coming of the Puritans to America. The author fails to put his best foot forward, for this is unquestionably the most unscholarly part of his work. If he had consulted the articles on Music and particularly that on Hymnody in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, even without inspecting the more ample authorities indicated there, he would have been enlightened. But when he comes to treat of the Puritans and the old Bay Psalm book, he is more at home, and—following Scholes's *The Puritans and Music*—he proves incontrovertibly that it is a vulgar superstition that "the Puritans hated music".

A digression tells the story of the music of those good people, the Moravians and the other early German settlers, in Pennsylvania. (There is nothing about Maryland.) Returning to the main theme, and following the sequence of time, we read of "The Transition of Psalmody to Hymnody". Interspersed throughout the text, more abundantly as we approach the present hour, somewhat like oases in the desert, are selections, lines, truly religious, sweet and inspiring, taken from the hymn books of the different periods treated. It is impossible to believe that the mind and heart which were so attuned to heavenly beauty as to have made such happy selections could be intentionally ungracious; yet the treatment of the "Roman" church is positively unfair. There is one striking exception to this anti-Catholic position the import of which the author himself can scarcely have fully grasped. He warns the Protestant composer that his compositions "carry within them the seeds of decay, because Protestant theology is not static." Did it not occur to so wise a man that Truth is static? This volume is evidence that Protestantism is still not dead, it is only in decay; nor is it without religion. These numerous selections from the hymns, even hymns of the twentieth century, are deeply religious. Here are fruit trees, rooted near running waters, in the American Protestant dust bowl, or perhaps it were better to say that here we have evidence of a plain of dried bones that only await a prophet's word to call them into resurgent life.

L. J. KENNY.

Father Huntington, Founder of The Order of The Holy Cross, by Vida Dutton Scudder. New York. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1940. pp. 375. \$3.50

James Otis Skinner Huntington, founder of the Anglo-Catholic Order of The Holy Cross, who was born in Boston in 1854, son of the Congregational minister and later Episcopalian Bishop, Frederic Dan Huntington and his wife, Hannah Dane Sargent, is the posthumously fortunate subject of this enthralling biography. The book will touch the heart strings of no one so much as the genuine Catholic. After the first pages, he will ask himself is this pathetic or amusing, and conflicting answers from within his conscience will still interest him long after the book has been laid aside.

When "Jimmie", the hero of this story, comes on the scene, his first utterance is one of complaint against his sister Ruth, who having donned their most reverend father's night shirt and mounting an imaginary pulpit, began to declaim: "The Lord is in His holy Temple"; whereat the horrified boy exclaimed: "Mama, Mama, I could not stop her. I told her only boys could do that." So it is throughout the entire life of the man. There can be no denying his utter sincerity; but it is difficult, rather impossible, to escape the conviction that here is an actor playing a part, a

great actor filled with the personality of the character whom he is impersonating.

Actors on the stage say and do admirable things. Every chapter here is replete with golden wisdom, and the vein grows richer as you advance. Take an example: The Order of the Holy Cross was to work especially for the poor. Some view the poor as sinners who are suffering the penalty of their crimes; others look upon them as merely unfortunate persons on whom it is good to bestow alms; but Father Huntington saw them rather as victims, victims of our social order. "Whose sin," he asked, "that of the drunkard alone? Or that of those responsible for the almost irresistible conditions under which he lived? And who were they?"

The organization of an Order of Monks within the Anglican community in America was a novelty, and an innovation; it was romanizing; and the founder received all manner of objections, from loving appeals to downright oburgations. His defense is that the church without orders grows decadent; the orders are indeed not necessary to the *esse* of the church, but they are necessary to its *bene-esse*. This flash of Latin scholasticism sealing the argument is not the reviewer's.

There can be little question that the charm of this work is due rather to the writer than to her subject. He, undoubtedly a soul of magnificent generosity and its consequent beauty, falls short both in his intense devotion to Henry George's Single Tax theory—a utopian dream—and in his reluctance to going over to Rome. He waited for a call of conscience, a conscience distinct from reason: "At times," he writes, "my whole head and heart have been with Rome. But then the thing that has given me pause was the absence of that prompting of conscience . . ." He had never heard the Lord say: "Are you also yet without understanding?" (Matt, XV, 16.) But the author has idealized him; there is a transfiguration, in which the whiteness as of the snow and the brilliance as of the sun with which she clothes him is more perfect than the subject himself.

The Catholic reader, however, must say of both the author and the "priest", seeing that you are what you are would that you were ours!

L. J. KENNY.

Tixier's Travels on the Osage Prairies, edited by John Francis McDermott and translated from the French by Albert J. Salvan. Norman. University of Oklahoma Press. 1940. pp. 297. \$3.00

This volume constitutes the fourth of the new American Exploration and Travel Series, each volume of which creates the fond hope that the series may grow and prosper. Victor Tixier's *Voyage aux prairies osages, Louisiane et Missouri, 1839-40* has become a very rare bit of western Americana. This fact, plus the account's innate excellence, makes the present well edited translation most welcome. A word of high commendation is due the editor, whose scholarly notes add very greatly to the understanding and the enjoyment of the Tixier account. The peculiar value of the present work lies in the fact that Tixier gives very full information concerning one of the important Plains tribes, of whose early history and customs too little has been known. He was among them at a time when the tribe was still intact and, though not completely immune from white influence, was as yet not too seriously affected by contact. By no means the least interesting sections of the work are those which deal with Louisiana and Missouri of the period and with some of the famous western figures. The editor has reproduced the pen sketches of Osage notables and of Osage types which Tixier made while on the Plains and which were used to illustrate the original French edition of the work. The addition of a map of the Tixier travels in the West is helpful and to be commended.

JOHN F. BANNON.

Montesquieu in America, 1760-1801, by Paul M. Spurlin. Louisiana State University Press. 1940. pp. xii + 302. \$3.00

In fairly recent years there has been a revival of interest in intellectual origins. One of the periods of special interest has been the eighteenth century with Montesquieu as one of the principal figures placed in focus.

The exact place of Montesquieu in America has, as Mr. Spurlin shows, been something of a matter of controversy. True, the more common opinion has been that the constitutions after 1776 were, in the words of a famous American historian, "... built by Americans on the solid foundation of colonial experience, with the timber of American practice, using Montesquieu as consulting architect;" but the precise influence has been in question, and there have been some who have attempted to belittle it.

Mr. Spurlin approaches the problem from a different angle. The conclusions drawn from supposed reflections in American

institutions of Montesquieu's theories are, after all, open to debate. Mr. Spurlin prefers to base his conclusions upon the presence of copies of Montesquieu available to the public in college libraries, private collections, and to the extent that Montesquieu was cited in newspapers, letters, diaries, speeches, etc., by the leaders of the thought of the day.

His conclusions are interesting. The colonials were surprisingly well acquainted with Montesquieu, his works being in almost every college library and in the collections of library societies and companies even at very early dates. Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* was an authoritative handbook of political information. His chapter on the English constitution was the most quoted portion of his works and was cited as the authoritative concise statement of this unwritten document. Whenever the name of an author is cited in the numerous controversies on the tripartite separation of powers, it is, with one exception, the name of Montesquieu. And next in order, he was often cited on confederate republics and upon the necessity of virtue in a republic. This work of Mr. Spurlin should prove of interest to students of American republican beginnings and more indirectly to those interested in Montesquieu himself.

R. L. PORTER.

Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences, III. New York. Social Science Research Council. 1940. pp. xi + 254.

This present is the third of a series of *Critiques* by the Committee on Appraisal of the Social Science Research Council. For discussion the Committee chose Walter Prescott Webb's *The Great Plains: A Study in Institutions and Environment*. The task of critic was assigned to Fred A. Shannon.

Mr. Shannon's appraisal, in which he goes over the work with a fine-tooth comb and leaves few of Mr. Webb's main contentions or conclusions unchallenged, covers a little better than one hundred pages. Mr. Webb's comment on the Shannon critique is then inserted. Mr. Webb, and this reviewer thinks with a good deal of justice, refuses "to accept Mr. Shannon's document as an appraisal." Then follows the report of the discussion or conference of "nine specialists in history and other social sciences," meeting together with Webb and Shannon. The conference reminds one most forcibly of some of the disputations of the late medieval philosophers, in its apparent uselessness.

The task which the Council proposes, that of "assaying the quality of completed pieces of research in the various social sciences," is, indeed, laudable. The merits of the effort herein reported are rather dubious, and the whole would seem to indicate that the Committee on Appraisal should devise some more fruitful method of "assay."

JOHN F. BANNON.

Music in the Middle Ages, by Gustave Reese. New York.

W. W. Norton. 1940. pp. vii + 502. \$5.00

This masterly volume which deserves the attention and commendation of everyone who has any genuine claim to musicianship, should be on the shelf of every representative library. The author, who aims to take account of the most recent research on the subject of music and to offer new interpretations of old facts, has this book as the proof of his success. The first point in its favor is the unbiased attitude which is manifested in the treatment of Church music. Secondly, statements are substantiated by reproductions of music from original or quite ancient manuscripts. Thirdly, considerable effort has been expended by the author to present the reader with some tangible means of applying criticism to the style of various types of music during different ages. Gregorian is given special treatment. The three sections of the book treat of Ancient Music of Asia, Egypt and Greece; Western European monody to about 1300; and Polyphony based on the perfect consonances and its displacement by polyphony based on the Third (14th century). The bibliography is especially commendable.

ROSARIO MAZZA.

The Teaching of History in Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Henry Johnson. Revised Edition. New York. Macmillan. 1940. pp. xvi + 468. \$3.00

In this revision of his earlier (1915) work, the professor emeritus of history of the Columbia University Teachers College has given us a volume which is very interesting and should prove very useful. His approach to all the problems connected with the teaching of history in elementary and secondary schools is thorough, scholarly and sane. His approach is almost invariably historical; the text abounds in citations; the footnotes give full references which can very readily be used for further work; and the extensive bibliography, arranged according to chapters, is invaluable.

If asked which chapters are the most interesting, the reviewer would find it very hard to answer. However, he found the chapters on "What History Is," "History in the School Curriculum," "The Question of Aims and Values," "Making the Past Real," and "Correlation, Fusion, and Integration" of more than ordinary interest. All chapters are pertinent and well done.

Professor Johnson has not offered us what might be called a "systematic" study of "The Teaching of History" in the technical sense of a book that pretends to solve all the problems discussed. He points out the various opinions and various practices, and concludes with some very common-sense comments from himself and others. Perhaps therein lies the best part of his work, for it should stir the curiosity of the history teacher to draw upon his own experimentation and further reading for additional light.

R. L. PORTER.

Political and Social Growth of the American People, 1865-1940, by Arthur Meier Schlesinger. Third Edition. New York. Macmillan. 1941. pp. xx + 783. \$3.25

This complement to the new edition of Hockett, reviewed in the November BULLETIN, rounds out the overhauling of the familiar partnership study of the history of the United States. In the process both men found it necessary to change the time limits of their respective volumes. Mr. Schlesinger's begins after the Civil War and carries the story well into 1940, instead of the earlier division of 1852 to 1933. In his revision the author, besides extending his treatment, has re-worked some of the other sections. Those acquainted with the earlier editions of this work will be pleased to find the same spirit of thoughtful scholarship and clarity of expression which they have come to expect from the distinguished author.

JOHN F. BANNON.

Reparation at the Paris Peace Conference, by Philip Mason Burnet. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. xxiv + 1148 and 833. \$15.00

If and when the present trouble in Europe ends as it did twenty-two years ago, the peace-makers will want to know everything that can be known about Versailles. The knowledge will not make a perfect world, but without it there is sure to be a lot of blind stumbling. True, the exploited distortions of Herr Hitler have made most of us very unwilling to admit that there was so much colossal bungling at the former peace table. But the two volumes of documents before us with their nearly two hundred pages of scholarly introduction, possess an intrinsic interest altogether aside from their pragmatic value. For the student of the great economic debacle they will have a special appeal.

The debates of statesmen and of experts, pre-armistice claims and estimates of damage, the investigation of Germany's capacity to pay, emotional factors and the balancing of national interests, bargaining among the leaders, the apportionment of the spoils, the fixing of the total sum and the imposing of the war guilt clause against the unheeded protests of the Germans,—all this and much more, arranged, classified, annotated and indexed with the best historical technique, is contained in these two thousand pages to edify or dishearten the reader. Americans will be cheered by the record of the more humane, just and reasonable demands of our spokesmen. We could, of course, afford to be magnanimous and disinterested in our appraisal of the situation. And our disinterestedness enabled us to see with less clouded vision. The important lesson for all concerned is not precisely the fact that the ablest men were blind and stupid, but that the sources of blindness and stupidity are likely to be with us again.

R. CORRIGAN.

James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England, by Helen Georgia Stafford. New York. Appleton-Century Company. 1940. pp. 336. \$3.75

A great amount of literature has been written during the last ten years concerning James' ill-fated mother, Mary Stuart. The mystery of Kirk o'Field, her conduct with Bothwell, her flight into England and death, are events which have received some notoriety. As a result of this, the birth and early years of James have been brought into prominence. A lapse of many years intervenes before he again appears on the stage of world history as James I, King of England.

The sixteen years elapsing between the death of Mary Stuart and the accession of James as the first Stuart ruler of England form the subject-matter of this book. For James this is a very important period, since it is during these years amid the intrigues and revolts of the noblemen and the wily schemes of Elizabeth that the character and policy of the future English king are developed.

Helen Stafford gives a very thorough account of these years. Beginning with his accession to the throne of Scotland, she treats successively his early troubles with the discontented nobles, his bickerings with Elizabeth over the intercepted Spanish Blanks, his attempts to secure peace throughout Europe, his connections with Essex, and his many schemes to secure the English succession.

No one can read this work without noticing the impartiality of the historian. Personal opinions and interpretations are suppressed although the conduct of James and Elizabeth offers the historian innumerable opportunities for a personal treatment. Instead of succumbing to this enticing temptation, special care seems to have been taken to present the facts clearly and unbiasedly, and to substantiate every dubious one with a copious supply of references to original sources.

The book is well written. The style is good but not remarkable. The detailed treatment given the various events of these years will prevent the book from ever becoming very popular. But this work will prove of invaluable assistance to the student of English and Scottish history. Besides its splendid and coherent treatment of the activities of James during these years, the value of the book is increased by the presence of many important geneological tables and a twenty-four page bibliographical guide.

RAYMOND R. MCAULEY.

The Catholic Church in Indiana, 1789-1834, by Thomas T. McAvoy. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. 226. \$2.25

A book that was needed, and one that is in two respects, at least, a pioneer. It was needed because until its appearance the story of Catholicity in Indiana as it appears in our historical literature might be indicated thus: QUEBEC, Baltimore, VINCENNES. After the period covered by the *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* there follows a hiatus in Indiana history corresponding to the years of Bishop Carroll's jurisdiction, when so many all-important activities touching the foundations of the American church were transpiring east of the Alleghenies and centering attention there. With the coming of Bishop Bruté in 1834 the new era began whose story has been often and well told.

Dr. McAvoy's volume occupies that hitherto almost vacant historical field, and presents rich storehouses of information, found in many widely scattered archives, hitherto unsearched, and it fully explains the political and economic antecedents that worked through two and a half centuries and made the decline of the early French in this field humanly speaking inevitable. Yet the work of the French was not barren. It was a planting time. The snows but covered the fruitful grain. He points out that wherever there was a lonely missionary chapel under the French regime, on that spot, and as a consequence, we may behold today the tall towers of a splendid Catholic church. He might have particularized and have pointed out the brightest glory of Indiana, the University of Notre Dame, of which he is the worthy archivist, standing over the grave of Allouez.

An unusually commendable feature of this work, one that may be pointed out as pioneering, is the prominent place given in its pages to the part the Catholic layman took in the work of sustaining the faith. There can be little hope for lay participation in Catholic Action to its full measure if our historical literature limits itself to ecclesiastical biographies. Again, Indiana is not the only state whose history suffers a hiatus; in fact, it is almost the first in which the account is now continuous and includes the layman's consecrated labors.

L. J. KENNY.

History of Civilization, by Hutton Webster. New York. D. C. Heath. 1940. pp. xix + 1051. \$4.50

The Development of European Civilization, by Clarence Perkins, Clarence H. Matterson and Reginald I. Lovell. New York. Prentice-Hall. 1940. pp. xxiii + 1174. \$4.50

Some day we should like to announce to the world, or at least to the readers of the BULLETIN, that the perfect text for freshmen has arrived. That day has not yet dawned. With a dozen or so recent surveys of civilization on the market we are torn between admiration for improved technique and sad disappointment at the failure of authors to approach an ideal which may be, after all, too high. If the primary purpose of history is to teach a broad-minded tolerance (a fallacy, no doubt, and perhaps a dangerous fallacy), we should be content to accept the publisher's estimate of his product. If we are looking for a correct view of man, his origin, nature and destiny (a not unreasonable objective

surely), then we should be merciless in castigating not the incidental flaws of a work, but the essential defects in its whole composite picture of past reality.

Two books have been lying on the editorial desk for several months. We could recommend either of them—with reservation, the amount of reservation being determined largely by the mood of the moment. In both there is the same apparent softening of statements that might offend this or that potential buyer. In price, in bulk and in general appearance the books are very much alike. The titles could be interchanged without loss or gain of either side. Yet in content and distribution of emphasis there is considerable difference. Hutton Webster's *History of Civilization* leans more to interpretation. He tells a more coherent, smoother-flowing story. If the reviewer has a decided preference for this type of narrative, he is aware that other instructors and perhaps the majority of students will find a more encyclopedic range of facts, and, consequently, a closer approximation to their idea of what history should be, in *The Development of European Civilization*. A good teacher can use either book, drawing upon history, common sense, reason and revelation for a fuller account of the unique historical postulate of creation and the unique historical fact of Christianity. On the question of Christian origins Webster has made a fair attempt at sympathetic treatment.

R. CORRIGAN.

Zenon Papyri, edited with introductions and notes by William L. Westermann, Clinton W. Keyes, and Herbert Liebesny. Vol. II. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. x + 222. \$6.00

Labor problems, the important question of business overhead, and the varied difficulties of produce marketing are all typical of modern 20th century economics. Yet that these very same problems were fundamental in the economic sphere of such an early era as the third century B. C. is clearly proved by the contents of this volume. Dr. Liebesny, Professors Westermann and Keyes are to be congratulated on the valuable addition they have made to modern scholarship in this interesting study of ancient papyri. Their results are of value not only to the professed scholar of ancient Egyptian history, but likewise to teachers and students of economic development.

The papyri here treated are part of a file dating back to the period of the Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt and represent the final supplement to the documents already published as *Columbia Papyri*, Greek Series, No. 3. The papers deal principally with the records of a certain Zenon, operator of one of the largest farm establishments of the day. Through them we gain an accurate insight into the varied activities of commercial life as the Egyptians knew it centuries ago.

The subject matter presents a surprisingly wide scope, ranging all the way from such trivial topics as complaints to police, wages to farm hands, dog breeding, letters of introduction, and brick-makers' memoranda, to the checking of suspicious accounts, usury and illegal detention, and registers of leased land. Of special note are three non-Zenon papyri, one of which is a royal decree pertinent to the allocation of a new tax on property income, while the other two are records of the business transactions of a wealthy woman fruit-grower, Eirene by name.

The work, on the whole, is well edited: the original texts are printed in facsimile with the lacunae creditably filled in by the scholarly suggestions of the editors. Each text is prefaced by an explanatory introduction and is followed by copious notes treating sundry grammatical difficulties; where there is doubt as to the original reading of the text, possible readings are supplied. The sum value of the book is greatly increased by a number of fine photographs of various papyri. As is to be expected, the work is strictly of a highly scholarly nature; the ordinary reader will find little to interest him in its textual analysis and grammatical dissection. Only those fully conversant with the intricacies of the Greek language will appreciate it at its true worth.

E. H. KORTH.

Devotees of St. Thomas Aquinas will be interested to know that the faculty of St. Albertus College, Racine, Wisconsin, are editing, under the title of *The Angel of Aquino*, an English translation of the extant prayers, hymns, and Mass composed by the Saint. This little volume which sells for either \$1.25 or \$0.75 likewise contains a Mass, meditations, novenas and various prayers in honor of the Angelic Doctor. An added feature is the encyclical letter on the saint by Pope Pius XI. The book will appeal not only to religious and seminarians, but also to adults, students, and adolescents. Copies may be obtained from St. Catherine's Press, Racine, Wisconsin.